

Part anal.

MAR 30 1936

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges

THE INTEGRITY OF THE AMERICAN
COLLEGE

THE COLLEGE AND THE PROFESSIONS

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-
SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

March, 1936

Architectural Planning OF THE American College

by

J. FREDRICK LARSON AND ARCHIE M. PALMER

THE authors have given, by description and illustration, an account of recent developments in college architecture with special reference to the small college. The text includes a presentation of the architectural advisory service of the Association, and an intensive study of the attainment of character in college architecture, the problems involved in campus development, and the planning of various types of college buildings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD by Dr. Robert L. Kelly, *Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges*

PREFACE

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION

II CHARACTER IN COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE

Tradition—Architectural Styles—Physical Environment—Social Environment—Development Factors—Materials—Interiors

III THE ARCHITECT AND THE COLLEGE

Selecting the Architect—Qualifications of the Architect—Principles of Professional Practice—Functions of the Architect—Compensating the Architect

IV PLANNING THE CAMPUS

Value of a Development Plan—Campus of Sufficient Area—Expansion by Land Accession—Development on a New Site—Quadrangular Type of Campus—Informal Residential Campus

V PLANNING THE BUILDINGS

The Administrative Offices—Libraries—Chapels—Auditoriums—Recitation Halls—Science Buildings—Buildings for the Fine Arts

VI PLANNING THE BUILDINGS (*Continued*)

Residence Halls—Social Unions—Dining Halls—Infirmaries and Health Centers—Recreational Units—Faculty Housing

VII SUGGESTED REFERENCES

8vo 181 pages,

Profusely Illustrated

\$2.00

ORDER FROM

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

19 West 44th Street

New York City



Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges

VOLUME XXII

MARCH, 1936

NUMBER 1

Edited by

ROBERT L. KELLY

Executive Secretary of the Association

MARTHA T. BOARDMAN

Editorial Assistant

RUTH E. ANDERSON

Contributing Editor

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section
1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1936-37

President: James R. McCain, President of Agnes Scott College.

Vice-President: James L. McConaughy, President of Wesleyan University.

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Comptroller of New York University.

Executive Secretary: Robert L. Kelly, New York City.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Robert M. Lester, Secretary of the Carnegie Corporation, Edward V. Stanford, President of Villanova College, Raymond Walters, President of the University of Cincinnati, Henry M. Wriston, President of Lawrence College.

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE: President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University, *Chairman*, Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo, President William C. Dennis, Earlham College, President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College, President E. J. Jaqua, Scripps College, President R. A. Kent, University of Louisville, President E. D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University, President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS: President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman*, Dean Roy J. Deferrari, The Catholic University of America, Director R. H. Fitzgerald, The State University of Iowa, President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation, Mr. J. Frederick Larson, Dartmouth College, Professor Arthur Pope, Harvard University.

COMMISSION ON MUSIC: President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College, *Chairman*, Professor G. S. Dickinson, Vassar College, President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, Dean Ernest Hutcheson, Juilliard Graduate School, Dr. W. S. Learned, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Professor Douglas Moore, Barnard College, Professor Paul J. Weaver, Cornell University, Professor Roy Dickinson Welch, Princeton University, Robert L. Kelly, *ex officio*.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: Controller J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan, *Chairman*, Treasurer Horace S. Ford, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, President John S. Nollen, Grinnell College, President John L. Seaton, Albion College.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE PERSONNEL: Dean A. C. Hanford, Harvard College, *Chairman*, Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University, President Tyler Dennett, Williams College, Professor Marshall E. Dimock, The University of Chicago.

(Continued on page 4)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE INTEGRITY OF THE COLLEGE	
<i>Editorial Notes</i>	5
Address of Welcome, <i>Herbert E. Hawkes</i>	9
The Integrity of the College, <i>Henry M. Wriston</i>	11
The British College, <i>A. E. Morgan</i>	27
The Integrity of the American College from the Standpoint of Administration, <i>Walter A. Jessup</i>	40
THE COLLEGE IN SOCIAL PROGRESS—FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE PROFESSIONS	
Professional Education in the Colleges, <i>Charles F. Wishart</i>	51
Social Progress and Engineering Education, <i>Clement C. Williams</i>	59
Some Modern Trends in Legal Education, <i>Paul Brosman</i>	67
The College in Social Progress from the Standpoint of Medicine:	
<i>John Wyckoff, M.D.</i>	78
<i>Fred C. Zapffe, M.D.</i>	82
THE LIBERAL COLLEGE IN THE TAX-SUPPORTED UNIVERSITY	
The Liberal College in the Tax-Supported University—Report of Section "B," <i>Frederick B. Robinson</i>	88
The Formulation of Aims That Meet Individual Needs and Are Adjusted to Current Life Applications, <i>Frederick B. Robinson</i>	90
Are There Aims That Are Peculiar to the Tax-Supported Colleges? <i>Lloyd C. Emmons</i>	99
Problems of Selective Admission, <i>Shelton Phelps</i>	105
TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION FOR WOMEN	
Higher Education for Women Today, <i>Kathryn McHale</i>	113
Fitting the Curriculum to the Student, <i>David Allan Robertson</i>	120
Special Efforts toward Encouraging Independence and Initiative, <i>C. Mured Thompson</i>	125
Utilization of Daily Life as a Distinct Part of Educational Procedure, <i>Mary Ashby Cheek</i>	129
The Relation between College Activities and Citizenship in the Outside World, <i>Henry W. Lawrence</i>	132
COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS	
College Instruction in the Arts—Report of Section "A," <i>Frederick C. Ferry</i>	135
The General Problems Involved in the Giving of Collegiate Instruction in Art:	
<i>Francis Henry Taylor</i>	137
<i>Roberta M. Fansler</i>	145
<i>Arthur Pope</i>	152
Discussion	157
PRESENT ALUMNI DEVELOPMENTS	
Developments in Alumni Education, <i>Florence H. Snow</i>	161
Developments in Alumni Money Raising, <i>Charles J. Miel</i>	168
Lay Participation in Alumni Organization, <i>Edna Lee Wood</i>	179

MORE RECENT COLLEGE PLANS

More Recent College Plans—Report of Section "C," *George B. Cutten* ... 185

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE YEAR

Report of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary for the Year 1935-36, <i>Robert L. Kelly</i>	187
Report of the Treasurer for the Year Ended December 31, 1935, <i>LeRoy E. Kimball</i>	197
Report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure for 1935-36, <i>James L. McConaughy</i>	202
Survey of the College Faculties—A Report for the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, <i>B. W. Kunkel</i>	206
Report of the Committee on the Enrolment of Students, <i>Charles J. Turck</i>	210
Preliminary Report of the Committee on Public Service Personnel, <i>A. C. Hanford</i>	213
Report of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities, <i>John C. Christensen</i>	218

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS

Minutes of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges	221
Newly Elected College Presidents	230
Members of the Association, 1936	231
Constitution and By-Laws of the Association	245
Former Presidents of the Association	247
A Spring Calendar of Educational Meetings	248

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1936-37 (Continued)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*, the Vice-President, *ex officio*, the Executive Secretary, *ex officio*.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: President Frank P. Graham, University of North Carolina (three years), Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, The University of Buffalo (two years), President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College (one year).

REPRESENTATIVE ON NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL: Professor E. L. Conklin, Princeton University.

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING. The Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges is to be held in Washington, D. C., on Thursday and Friday, January 14 and 15, 1937. The Mayflower Hotel has been selected as the headquarters for this meeting. As usual, the meetings of the various denominational college associations and the Council of Church Boards of Education will be held during the same week.

CHANGES IN COMMISSIONS. The Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers was temporarily discontinued by the Executive Committee on February 18. For the suspension of other Commissions for 1936, see the Minutes of the Twenty-second Annual Meeting, page 222.

COLLEGE MUSIC. Discussions pro and con concerning Thompson's *College Music* continue to enliven educational meetings and the press. *The Journal of Higher Education* for February carried a review by Archibald T. Davidson of Harvard University. Mr. Davidson is a staunch defender of the point of view of the Thompson book.

SPECIAL PROJECTS. At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Association held in the Association office February 18, 1936, much progress was made in developing the five special projects referred to in the Annual Report of the Executive Committee (see p. 193). In brief, these projects are:

A service for the purchase of music talent of high order for concerts for the colleges.

A system of grants-in-aid to present and prospective college teachers of music.

The preparation of a book dealing with the imponderables of college music.

The stimulation of music choruses or festivals.

A special Commission on Music under the chairmanship of President Wilkins of Oberlin College has been appointed, to assist in guiding these developments.

In connection with the concert series which is referred to above, the Association office will soon ask member colleges for specific data as to the present state of music performances on the campus with the purpose of establishing a background of information as a basis of administrative procedure.

The preparation of a book on the coordination of the college library and the educational program of the college.

TAX SERVICE. The special Tax Service of the Association office inaugurated since the Annual Meeting of 1936 is already assuming rather striking proportions and many expressions of appreciation are being received from member college presidents and other officers.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE COLLEGE

ROBERT L. KELLY: This means that the liberal college must remain liberal or become liberal if it is now liberal only in name. . . .

We are preparing men for any kind of a task which may come to them as the years go on. We are attempting in the liberal colleges to educate men and women, not to train men and women. The training of men and women belongs to other agencies. It does not belong to the liberal college. The liberal college has to do with education.

The Association of American Colleges is interested in the fundamental adjustments, not in patent medicines, not in pulling rabbits out of the hat. The Association of American Colleges is interested in teaching students to avoid immediacy and to cultivate continuity in their lives. The Association of American Colleges, as I understand it (perhaps I am mistaken) believes in the enduring experiences of the human race and would prepare students for enduring experiences.

HENRY M. WRISTON: More than twenty-five years ago one of the early reformers in education began to insist that the college should drop the last two years. Intermittently during the progress of our adventures in an educational wonderland, "Off with his head!" has been repeated. Occasionally someone has suggested a compromise; give the colleges three years—take off the head just above the ears. That much will never be missed!

Still more recently the suggestion has been made that lacking a head it be given more feet by adding the last two years of high school to the college. Thus it will have four years; so it should be satisfied.

WALTER A. JESSUP: How the college is to maintain its integrity by rising above standards that are external and irrelevant is a problem that must be faced if we are to discover new standards closer to the heart of genuine education. What is the college for? Is it an end in itself or is it an agency that can be justified only as it constantly perfects its adjustment to a clear purpose? So many of us are beset with operating problems of one kind or another that we are more or less continuously promoting our institutions instead of critically considering their function. We find that the public understands the conventional standards and can be brought to join in an attempt to conform to them. The public understands what it means to be added to or dropped from some approved list. With the short tenure of college presidents, it is not surprising that much of the time and attention of an institution is directed toward the standardizing agencies. Thank Heaven, there are indications that there is a change. . . .

The future of each and every college will be determined by its ability to *find its job*, to undertake only as much of a program as it can carry on honestly, to select students who can profit by its resources, to leave to other agencies everything else. Fortunate will be the college which can include in its inventory of resources a few really great persons as teachers, men and women actually worth knowing because of the ripeness of their scholarship and the richness of their lives. Superior to any particular forms and limits of organization, it is the currents set in motion alone by such an influence and atmosphere that can effectually meet the demands of a diverse and exacting student body and worthily maintain the traditional glory of the American college.

A. E. MORGAN: I think it may be said that in some respects Great Britain has made a real contribution through the ages to this problem of developing education of a liberal kind. . . . England has turned out from her universities men who have been most magnificent leaders of society. Traditionally, it has been the ancient universities that have done this work. And what is

the system on which they were trained? It was on those fundamental subjects, philosophy, classical literature, language and mathematics; those mainly were the disciplines on which the politicians and the statesmen and the great servants of the state were reared, so that there must be in those disciplines something of value. . . .

I am distinctly nervous of our tendency today, at any rate in England, to take our boys and girls as they come from the schools and go up to the universities, and make them into inadequate, squinting little experts.

PAUL BROSMAN: Prelegal requirements continue an upward trend, and each year sees at least one or two institutions hoist the minimum number of entrance hours over the two-year requirement of the standardizing agencies.

JOHN WYCKOFF, M.D.: I believe in the case of the average medical student the amount of such (foundation) work taken in college should be limited but thorough, and that the medical school is wise to give preference to students who have done good work in the subjects actually required rather than to those who have done indifferent work in more advanced courses in the same subjects. . . . Medicine is intimately related to and interested in many things: the social sciences, economics, philosophy, history, literature. In the brief time remaining to the student in college, I believe it more advantageous for the prospective doctor to learn thoroughly something of one or two, rather than to skim over many.

FRED C. ZAFPPE, M.D.: Studies which have been made for the Association of American Medical Colleges for a considerable number of years show that the men with an A.B. degree, for instance, stand head and shoulders in accomplishment above those who have had a B.S. degree. They have more clear records; fewer failures. That, I think, is quite significant. . . .

I have always felt convinced that if we could get the colleges to disregard us in every way, except for this minimum, and get their students to take more of the cultural work in the college, discourage them from taking so much science, or too much science, the result would be better than it is.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

HERBERT E. HAWKES

DEAN OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

IT IS my honored and pleasant function to welcome the Association of American Colleges to New York. It seems strange that any one should need to be welcomed in any formal way to this city, since most of you are as much at home here as any of us. But nevertheless we are highly pleased to offer you such hospitality as we are able. I must observe, however, that many people who come to New York much prefer to enjoy themselves in their own way.

I am told that the theme that will run through the addresses and discussions of the next day or two will be the proposition that if the American college is to render the greatest public service, it must preserve its own integrity. As I read, in a letter from our Secretary, this worthy text, I fell to wondering of just what this integrity consists which we must preserve at all costs. Why do young men and women find that going to college contributes to their capacity for public service in the most vital sense? If we knew the answer to that question we would have defined the integrity of the college that we value so highly.

In changing times values take on different aspects, and find different definitions. At some times we would have said that the distinguishing contribution of the college education was the gaining of what we are pleased to call a general culture, which in past days consisted of a more or less thorough acquaintance with classical languages and literatures, together with some training in mathematics and a certain introduction to philosophy. Some would contend that a specific training for the calling that one expects to enter constitutes the greatest value of the college experience. I am certain that some boys go to some colleges in order to meet the right people with whom they hope to be associated in later life. One might mention a score of values that have loomed large at one time or another for many of our students and consequently for our colleges.

At the present time I think that one may place in the foreground of these values something that we all have recognized,

but which just now, in the hurly-burly and confusion of all our economic, social and intellectual and moral life assumed an importance that cannot be neglected. If by integrity we mean the possession of that uprightness and rectitude which enables us and our students to meet the world in which we are submerged squarely and intelligently, there is only one way to maintain it. Surrounded by the intellectual, and social and moral confusion it is absolutely necessary for us to see to it that during the entire college experience our students acquire the habit of viewing dispassionately and objectively all sides of the questions that confront them. To expose them to only one side of controversial questions that they meet in their college work, to refuse to analyse and place in its setting the various approaches that men have made and are making toward a solution of our problems is to turn our backs on rectitude and integrity.

It is not always easy for us really to comprehend why other peoples and individuals think and feel and act as they do. It is difficult for us today to sense just why the massive art of the Egyptians, the strange perspective of the Orientals, the extreme decorativeness of the eighteenth century seemed so beautiful to the people who created these forms of art. It is not easy to understand how rational human beings can be either intellectually or emotionally satisfied with some of the divergent approaches to the social situation favored by various groups today—the capitalistic, the communistic, the socialistic, the Fascist, the autocratic, the old deal and the new deal approaches. But unless in our colleges we treat all of these approaches dispassionately and seriously, we do not know the human spirit, for all of these attitudes are attitudes of sincere and serious human beings with whom our next generation must live. The only way that they can do so with the support of a satisfying philosophy of their own is to understand the point of view of those with whom they are in complete disagreement.

I say, therefore, that the only way to preserve the integrity of the college and that of the students whom the college serves is to prove all things in the hope that an informed and honest person will cling to that which is good.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE COLLEGE

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

HENRY M. WRISTON

PRESIDENT OF LAWRENCE COLLEGE

IN TIMES of stress man is fain to find a scapegoat for his troubles. At such times the ancient doctrine to which Rousseau, for example, adhered, is preached again. Man, by nature, is good. He is corrupted by institutions. Therefore change the institutions—so that the true and beautiful nature of man may emerge. Today all institutions are under fire. Proposals for remaking them are to be found on every hand.

Educational institutions naturally share this plague of proposals with all other types. The American college has not produced persons capable of bringing in the millennium; therefore it has broken down. It must be reconstructed. Historically it grew, "like Topsy"; that must be the trouble. There must be a plan. A new college must be fabricated and articulated. These are the words of nearly all the reformers. Whatever is, is wrong. Let us "make a plan" and "rebuild." All these words betray the dominance of the engineer, of the mechanistic concept of the world and all that dwells therein. The apotheosis of the engineer has made us think always in terms of plans, of construction and machinery. We do not understand man. So we talk about the things we understand. Institutions are conceived as structures; they approximate manufacturing plants. We feed in the raw freshman and take out the alumnus—or as it is called, the "end-product." Looking upon the end-product we perceive that it is not good. So we will tear down the institutions, redesign the machinery and produce something else. Upon what we will produce, no one agrees—just so it be different from the past and present, and "better," especially "socially" better. We must remake society, a better whole out of worse parts. It's a wonder no one suggested it as a W.P.A. project!

Not having the faintest idea what we want, we must approach the matter experimentally. Here our second modern god appears—the scientist. He experiments and produces marvels. We will

experiment and doubtless marvels will follow. Some experiments will be controlled. Others will be with deuces wild—at least many have been. Knowing more and more about man in nature and less and less about the nature of man, we will follow the procedures that produced the first result and hope, against all evidence, that they will reverse the second.

I grew up, unwittingly, under the 9-4-4-3 plan which was later modified to an 8-4-4-3 plan, then to a 6-3-3-4-3 plan. The latest stream-lined model is 6-4-4-3-2. All this abracadabra would make an ordinary numerologist tremble. But are not figures and formulae the data of the engineer and the physicist? By these catalytic numerals we unite our twin gods into one.

More than twenty-five years ago one of the early reformers in education began to insist that the college should drop the last two years. Intermittently during the progress of our adventures in an educational wonderland, "Off with his head!" has been repeated. Occasionally someone has suggested a compromise; give the colleges three years—take off the head just above the ears. That much will never be missed! Still more recently the suggestion has been made that lacking a head it be given more feet by adding the last two years of high school to the college. Thus it will have four years; so it should be satisfied.

It is said in defense of all these suggestions that it—whatever "it" may be at the moment—conforms more nearly to "natural" divisions, of which there are none! Adolescence does not come on perfect schedule. It does not have standardized effects educationally nor even physically.

It is said in further defense of proposed reforms that they will save time. It reminds me of the salesman trying to persuade the farmer to feed his hogs cracked corn. "Hogs can digest it faster," said the salesman. "Well," said the farmer, "what's a hog's time worth?" Suppose we do learn faster. Suppose a high school graduate "knows" as much as the college graduate of a century ago. What of it? Have not likewise the horizons of knowledge widened? Have not the difficulties of synthesis increased and become more acute as they have become more complex? Does the high school graduate have as satisfactory a philosophy of life (I suppose one should say "environmental ad-

justment'') as did the college graduate of a hundred years ago? Not if the reformers are right, he hasn't.

Anyway, what is the hurry? Does business or industry or the professions want them faster and faster or better and better? What is their complaint? Not of our structures, techniques, or cabalistic numbers, but that the college graduate has not breadth, mental and moral energy, emotional stability, and readiness to learn still more.

To what goal do we hurry them? Skid them rapidly over general education with survey courses that they may enter the portals of specialization. As though that were the end and aim of man. It may prove his end, but never again his aim. We live among the indubitable blessings of specialization, but we suffer from its undeniable shortcomings. Seeing those deficiencies of specialization as an ideal one would expect a more balanced emphasis. It is about twenty-five years too late for this distortion to go unchallenged. We know that these premature specialists will, many of them, go out to give a "general" education which they neither understand nor believe in. Others will distort the procedures of business, of law, of social and political organizations through narrowness of outlook and lack of broad views. Specialized training we must have. But with every profession overcrowded, why not defer it until it may rest upon a broad and sure foundation?

At the same moment that we listen to the juggling of time signals, we are told that the conception of a timed education is wrong anyway. Some learn faster than others. The four-year period is ridiculed as "time-serving," and the jail is held the closest analogy to the college. Indeed the jail is held to be the more liberal. From a sentence to jail a man may deduct time for good behavior, whereas the college sentence contains no such mitigation. Let us admit that there has been too much time-serving. Is the cure to substitute some other unit in place of time? If it is not all-important, is it therefore unimportant? What is to be gained by establishing some new arbitrary unit which likewise may be short-circuited so far as intellectual growth is concerned? Why not suggest that the time be used profitably? Perhaps that would be too simple an answer.

In point of fact you must give the bachelor's degree upon an arbitrary basis. It may be arbitrary in point of time. It may be arbitrary in point of matter. Hitherto it has always been a combination of these two—four years and a certain mastery more or less certainly estimated or measured. Now it is sought to use only the arbitrary measure of material learned; time being held of no essential importance. Yet the chief protagonist of this view reports that the time element remains for most substantially four years. This fact comes closer than any previous datum to lending statistical validity to a conception that is rejected.

It is insisted that our estimates of achievement have not been true measures. Very well, improve them, but what has that to do with the structure of the institution? It is said we must change it all because it takes too long to get a degree. How long is too long? Is someone worried lest a person might know too much, have too broad an outlook, or too mature a judgment to justify a bachelor's degree?

Again, the complaint is made that the degree does not mean anything. Does any present proposal for reform stand a chance of changing the situation? Degrees have been granted for hundreds of years. Never until relatively recently did anyone dream of standard degrees. More of the apotheosis of the engineer. A degree, historically, was precisely what it appeared to be, a grant from an institution which gave the student upon any grounds that seemed reasonable to it, its *imprimatur*. I suppose I should say *exequatur*. The master's degree was granted later without residence or examination upon the theory that an educated man would keep on growing intellectually. Only when the tailor-made product of the American college proved that false, was the master's degree made a degree in course; it is scarcely more reputable in consequence. Degrees granted by an institution were, by courtesy and faith in its integrity, recognized elsewhere. The recognition rested only upon the assumption of its integrity.

A standardized degree is impossible. The same degree will always mean more from some institutions than from others. Why not? Does anyone expect all the students who go to an American college to get their money's worth? They do not get their money's worth uniformly anywhere else. Recently I read an

advertisement of an agency devoted to that business. It stated that "the best full-page advertisement attracts fourteen times as many readers as the worst." The cost of preparing the worst may be greater than the cost of the best. That is a statistic; therefore it must be right; blessed be statistics! Yet no one is seeking to standardize the value of a full-page advertisement. Some buy well; some buy badly. It is so, it will be so, in education. If, by the aid of an institution, a man achieves a liberal education he may pay some part of the cost, but he cannot pay with any price for the value received. If by reason of slothful will, blunted purpose, or want of integrity in the institution, he fails to get an education, any payment is wasted. He has suffered damage by lingering in an environment which yielded him no profit.

Whatever structure, system, or measure you adopt, some men will barely meet your arbitrarily established essentials for your degree. Others will achieve goals far in excess of any minimum standard you set. The degree has never been, and never will be, a measure of a man's education. There is no reason to wish it were.

There can be no standard degree, and there can be no standard college. It looked for a time as though an effort would be made to achieve those results. It is in process of abandonment, and speed the day of its total eclipse. It is inconceivable that there should be such a thing as a "standard" faculty. When all the statistics are gathered and all the studies are made, they do not explain Socrates or Jesus or any other significant teacher. Teaching is, and remains, an art. It is the projection of one's personality. The phrase a "standard personality" would be a contradiction in terms.

Let us forget the eternal tinkering with the structure and form. We have the four year college. No one has found a substitute for it that wins approval of others. Let it stand. Let us cease trying to imitate the engineer's slick efficiency in automatic packaging which would measure out the precise dehydrated weight of a *quantum* of information and label the package A.B. That is not the ideal at all.

What is the ideal? It is growth, physically, mentally, spiritually, emotionally, esthetically. It is the achievement and the

refinement of a sense of values. Growth at the adult level cannot be measured accurately. Intellectual achievement may be measured better than moral growth, or emotional development, or esthetic discrimination, or spiritual power. Some of these cannot, in any objective sense (in any engineering or scientific sense) be measured at all. But they can be recognized. Sometimes we act as though subjective judgment were a synonym for utter damnation. It may be, but not necessarily. Judgments may be wise, just, penetrating, constructive. It all depends upon the judge. Behold a statistic has shown that a series of judges, good, bad, and indifferent with different ideals, aims, and personalities have judged the same student work variously. That is not the point. The point is to get good judges and accept their variations as inherent. Members of the Supreme Court of the United States serve for life. They are protected from many forms of pressure. But they do not often vote unanimously. Wise, just, learned, impartial men will always have individual standards of value. So be it. Let us measure where we can. Where we cannot measure, let us form responsible judgments. A premature effort to weigh the imponderables will do vastly more harm than good, for it will lay a false emphasis upon externals, upon the forms. It will withdraw attention from the substance and the significant realities.

The definition I have postulated has an effect upon the question of the time element in a college course. So far as "book-knowledge" is concerned, either the four year degree or the degree given wholly on the basis of examination may produce almost identical results. But only a denial that growth requires time, and an assumption that student life has little significance outside rigidly academic pursuits could induce one to insist that the total result of the two systems could be the same.

The basic requirements for the degree reflect the values which the college holds significant. If intellectual achievement is the exclusive goal, the time element may become subordinate. If on the other hand physical, emotional, esthetic, spiritual and social values seem significant to the college, even though they may not be metered or measured, then time is of the essence of the matter.

The opportunity to secure a degree by passing a test without reference to time spent in residence is obviously an inducement to

do so. In so far as it is an incentive to save time it encourages an abnormal concentration of attention upon a single phase of experience, and tends to slight other significant aspects of life. It is an encouragement to skimp leisure, to eschew social life, to neglect church and the life of the spirit generally, and to wear down the body by failure to have sufficient diversity of activity and interest. Even within the intellectual sphere it has some undesirable tendencies. Almost inevitably it puts a premium upon "book-learning" as distinct from reflective thinking, upon getting the material rather than bringing it into an organized relationship to some framework of values. Reflective synthesis is seldom achieved under pressure; one must chew the cud of reflection in something approximating leisurely calm. There, alone, if time is so utilized, is adequate justification for four years.

We disapprove the business man who becomes so absorbed in his manufacturing or mercantile activities that he allows the politician to run the city and the state, the preacher to run the church, his wife to run the home, and his children to run to the movies. Why then should we set up a system of education which approximates in its emphasis the very things which we abhor in our civilization?

One of the best teachers I ever had urged us always to reason from a strong case. Very well. Suppose you knew that Student A who came to your college was going to live a healthy, normal, robust life, and be killed in an automobile accident the day he received his degree. Suppose he and all but yourself were in ignorance of that fact. You alone had responsible knowledge of it. Upon what basis would you organize his college years?

Would you distract attention from present reality and its exigent problems and satisfactions by dogging him to make up his mind about a vocational adjustment? Would you hurry him forward to some intense specialization? Would you insist that he was in college for intellectual discipline and that all his energies should be poured into that—all else to be a by-product? Not at all. We should recognize that whatever significance would ever attach to his college experience would be immediate. We should want him to acquire a sense of values, an acquaintance with beauty, a philosophy of life that included death. In short, we should want those four years to have intrinsic significance,

a value not dependent upon future use, upon income, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature.

In place of that omniscient knowledge about the future of one student we have complete, or almost complete, ignorance of the future of all students. Their futures are unpredictable. Despite all our personnel techniques, as long as there is growth, they will remain so. That point suggests the same solution as in the earlier hypothetical case. College is an experience valid within itself, or not valid at all. It is dependent for its genuine validity upon nothing that follows. The immediacy of these values does not mean that they are transitory. That they are present values does not mean that they do not encompass the future. They are stable values. Therefore they have significance not only for college years, but become part of the student's continuing and permanent equipment.

College is an experience both individual and social; it is intellectual, physical, emotional, spiritual. It is a time for the maturation of personality. By definition, maturity requires time; it should not be unduly hastened by hothouse methods. It may be influenced toward perfection by controlled environment.

Therefore, with the insistence of President Robert Maynard Hutchins that "the three worst words in education are character, personality, and facts," I cannot agree. "Personality," he says, "is the qualification we look for in an anti-intellectual teacher. . . . Apparently we insist on personality in the teacher because we cannot insist upon intellect; we are anti-intellectual." This is a characteristic modern statement. It sets up a sharp antithesis and ignores all middle ground. It is a false antithesis; much more could be said in defense of the thesis that personality and intellect are interdependent.

"We talk of character," he goes on to say, "as the end of education because an anti-intellectual world will not accept intelligence as its proper aim. Certainly since the *Meno* of Plato we have little reason to suppose that we could teach character directly. Courses in elementary, intermediate, and advanced character will fail of their object. The moral virtues are formed by lifelong habit, to which a university education contributes, but which it cannot be its primary purpose to supply. A university education must chiefly be directed to inculcating the intel-

lectual virtues, and these are the product of rigorous intellectual effort."

Why set up an antithesis between character and intelligence? Only for purposes of discussion may one distinguish between the two. Personality is divisible only through abnormality. Therefore neither character nor intelligence is complete or safe without the other. Therefore character is as much a sound product of education as intellect. While it is true that courses in elementary, intermediate, and advanced character will fail, it is equally true that courses in elementary, intermediate, and advanced intellectual virtue would also fail. It is not alone the moral virtues which are formed by lifelong habit; precisely the same statement can be made regarding the intellectual virtues. If the intellectual virtues are the product of rigorous effort, may not the same statement be made regarding the moral virtues? The basic problem is the same, it is the problem of self-mastery, of self-discipline. Without that fundamental achievement neither character nor intellect will thrive. As was said long ago, "He that setteth at nought wisdom and discipline is miserable."

College years should supply the opportunity for and stimulate the exercise of both. To insist upon this is not to be anti-intellectual. On the other hand to insist upon intellectuality at the sacrifice of all else is to deny the whole process of education itself. If our aim is to escape the domination of facts and to erect ideas and principles into their adequate stature, we must not begin by destroying the possibility of synthesis, through insistence upon the disparate nature of the elements of experience. Cold intellectualism never solved any problem that daunted mankind. Somewhere in the motives that carried forward the work or in the interpretation of the data, emotion played its inevitable part. Over-emphasis upon intellectualism may produce a wholly undisciplined emotional nature and lead to wild excesses. Character, personality, intelligence belong together. In isolation or imbalance they lose significance. Professor Whitehead summed it up with the remark, "Wisdom is the fruit of a balanced development. It is this balanced growth of individuality which it should be the aim of education to secure." This is simply the echo of Solomon's great prayer, at the critical juncture of his career, for an "understanding heart to . . . discern between good and bad."

Let us admit without cavil that values cannot be transmitted by direct teaching procedures. They must, in Professor Hocking's magnificently simple phrase, "be felt." Each is a new discovery for each individual. That does not mean that we may not facilitate discovery. We may, we should, surround him with beauty. Not the history of art merely, not the analysis of art alone, not art only in the curriculum, but daily, natural, inevitable association with beauty; care in our architecture, in our landscaping, in our dormitory and classroom decoration; incentives to surround himself with artistic things—these are obligations upon us. Music not alone as an intellectual problem, but music, great music, as often and as insistently as possible; that should be an inevitable concomitant of college life. Beauty, also in science; let not the biologist become so engrossed with his classifications that he does not turn aside to point out the sheer beauty of what may be had for a glance. Our campuses teem with birds, which the students never hear and which they do not see. Let not the astronomer fail in his descriptions of the stars to remind his students that a shepherd boy once said, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handywork."

If we as faculty members live ever in sensitive awareness to beauty, we create the environment wherein the student may come to his own discovery naturally and almost inevitably. Most of our teaching is by unconscious example rather than by verbal effort. Wordsworth with poetic insight said at the conclusion of *The Prelude*:

Prophets of Nature, we to them will speak
A lasting inspiration, sanctified
By reason, blest by faith: what we have loved,
Others will love, and we will teach them how;
Instruct them how the mind of man becomes
A thousand times more beautiful than the earth
On which he dwells. . . .

When men prate about the necessary reconstruction forced upon us by the economic debacle it gets somewhat wearisome. What effect has it had upon the glory of nature, upon our literary and our intellectual inheritance, upon our heritage of art from all the ages and every continent, upon the universal language

and literature of music, upon an emotional life that is well ordered and adequately disciplined? None of them is taxed or invalidated. It has deprived our students of a few things their fathers never had and never missed. It has made their physical life a shade more difficult—but, except in isolated, tragic cases, not insupportable.

For centuries history has emphasized the rôle of individuals in shaping their own lives and the events in which they participated. Every great ethical system has put the individual and his supremacy over his lower nature at its center. Not until twentieth century experimental psychology made individual differences a scientific discovery did we get excited over the matter. Is it not amazing that just as the individual took on this fresh significance he ceased to be important? The reformers are bent not upon the reconstruction of men, but of society. As Norman Foerster well remarked, "We are in danger of so emphasizing the concept of society that we cannot remember the concept of the individual." Under this misdirection we bid the student look around him and concern himself with the poor, with peace, with politics—with everything outside himself and upon which his impact will be negligible at that stage.

He should be trained socially. But the root of that training must be some emotional drive. Shall it be purity of race deified, as with Hitler? Shall it be any of the other hysterias and fanatisms which betray a distorted emotional life? I suggest that his first preoccupation be with peace. But not international peace—nor even peace with others. Let him make peace with himself. How many students do you know (how many adults?) who have yet cast the beam from their own eyes? I am not suggesting a course in elementary, intermediate, and advanced beam-casting. The life of the college flows under the bridges the courses build. I am suggesting that beneath all the sleek data-dominated efficiency of our personnel services some wise person should know the student. With never a technical phrase, with never a complex in his vocabulary, he should seek to assist the student in his groping for a coherent pattern of values, by which his own life may seem valuable but worth risking in some high enterprise. Before he sets out to conquer the world, let him conquer himself. That takes time. It is not the function of some well compounded

hash in a survey course to nourish that quality. Nothing that we know about individual differences justifies this overemphasis upon society. The great religious leaders of our world history have called for the spiritual regeneration of men. They have never excused them upon the ground of social pressures. They have approached reform not wholesale, not by the reconstruction of society directly, and as a whole, but by the regeneration of the hearts and minds of those who composed society. That regeneration is still fundamental.

Beyond this personal experience he must, of course, have social experience. It lies ready to hand. The campus is a social laboratory. It is a world in microcosm. It has all the problems of the world. Poverty is there, privilege is there, selfishness, greed, race problems and prejudices. There is even a species of international relations, for the deviousness and chicanery of international politics can teach nothing to interfraternity rivalries. This may remind the student that the economic interpretation of international life is not the whole story. Here is a world ripe for his reforming zeal. It is small, indeed, but big enough, heaven knows. Why do we, and why does he, neglect it for wider horizons? The answer is simple. It is always easier to solve the other fellow's problem. It is always easier to form judgments that do not carry responsibility, and to propose actions which others must take. The campus is a field for "shared activity" ripe unto the harvest. Anyone who, as an undergraduate, reaps fruitfully in that field will be well equipped to wield his sickle manfully in the world abroad. He will have had no imitation of experience, no synthetic reform; he will have lived significantly and may be trusted to go on doing so.

Much of this experience in value discovery, in personal discipline, and in social effectiveness will be extra-curricular. Whoever is guilty of the heresy that the curriculum is the whole of a liberal college should promptly recant. The American college in its origins and for more than two hundred and fifty years was built upon no such false doctrine. The faculty was with the student in his uprising and his down-sitting, his prayers, and his meals. It was not unusual for a faculty member—for a consideration—to manage an undergraduate's finances. The history of chapel exercises is ample evidence that traditional concern was not limited to

intellectual attainments. The final faculty meeting to vote degrees was dominated by no registrar with his course-credit complex. The student was discussed in all his aspects. There was regularly committed that recently discovered academic deadly sin of confusing "personality evaluation with measurements of intellectual attainments." If the reformers have their way we shall sin no more. We shall simply omit the personality evaluation and graduate anyone who can pass an examination without having been caught in acts jeopardizing the good name—of the students? No, of the institution. I am opposed to the sin, but equally to the proposed remedy. In the traditional American college the standards of moral behavior were maintained by a watchful faculty wielding pains and penalties. To this day most colleges exercise a discipline upon the personal conduct of students—often punishing them for acts which the institution does not seek to prevent either by influence or control. I am proposing no return to old procedures, but with all my heart I am proposing a return to the ideals which lay behind those procedures. Let the college seek to graduate scholars, not only, but gentlemen. Let it employ all its powers, residential, curricular, architectural and esthetic, personal and professional, to that end.

Without shame we have undertaken programs of physical education not primarily intellectual in character. We have set up infirmaries and health services. When a man is emotionally starved we offer him a psychiatrist. Why then should we tremble if it is suggested that we deal constructively and responsibly with the problems of values, with emotional and spiritual and esthetic growth? President Henry Sloane Coffin summed it all up when he said, "A man's wealth may be estimated by the number and intensity of his appreciations. An education which renders a student stronger in his power to criticize than in his capacity to enjoy is ruinous."

Nothing that I have said discounts at all the criticisms of the intellectual program of the college. That surely must be strengthened. Adequate emphasis upon emotional and spiritual values will contribute to that end. The exercise of the mind is a painful experience for most people most of the time. It requires some great objective to induce one to bear the agony of thought. "Adjustment to a social order" is not a very passionate ideal.

Making money may be—and probably accounts somewhat for the superior industry of those taking training and professional work. The liberal arts college is not a training school—though the element of training has been introduced irrelevantly in response to one sort of pressure or another.

If, instead, we set as our objective an exciting experience in self-realization, there is a goal worth striving for. Public interest in football has led us to think that exhibitionism is the motive which will encourage boys to endure hardship. Those who go in for cross-country running, or the half mile, go through a rigorous training, a grueling physical experience. They face a certainty of fatigue, pain, tension, and strain. But usually very few see them run. They do it from an innate desire to realize their fullest potentialities for speed and endurance. The improvement of their time against their own previous record brings profound satisfaction. It is self-realization upon the physical side.

Emotional self-realization produces the same sort of drive. Students will work like slaves to produce a play. They will enter into the script and, without the technical training of an actor, do astonishingly well in interpreting difficult parts. They will sing the great choruses of *The Messiah* or the chorales of Bach with freshness, with devotion, and with appreciation. For these and many other forms of emotional expression they will make sacrifices of time and energy, meet with disappointment and failure—then try again and yet again. Religious self-realization is much more rare. Why? Of course it is intrinsically more elusive, more difficult. More important, however, is the fact that we do not offer like enthusiastic and assured leadership.

Intellectual self-realization is the adequate objective within that field of effort. It does not need the adventitious aid of a money-making future or of a paved avenue to some profession. If a man has moral certainty and self-confidence arising from self-realization, he will not be worried unduly about his economic capacity when that problem becomes exigent, if it has not already become so. This we know if we have ever been teachers. And personal experience is fortified by the fact that students in colleges of the liberal arts have made on the whole the best showing in tests taken by many kinds of institutions. The more purely

they have been devoted to the liberal arts, the better the showing. Allowing for all kinds of reservations due to self-selection and other factors, the record is still impressive.

Again Wordsworth states the ideal:

... the enduring and the transient both
Serve to exalt; they build up greatest things
From least suggestions; ever on the watch
Willing to work and to be wrought upon,
They need not extraordinary calls
To rouse them; in a world of life they live,
By sensible impressions not enthralled
But by their quickening impulse made more prompt
To hold fit converse with the spiritual world,
.....the highest bliss
That flesh can know is theirs—the consciousness
Of whom they are, habitually infused
Through every image and through every thought.

Once this ideal is put at the center of the work of the college much else falls into perspective. Formal organization ceases to have so much influence. Courses and curriculum can be greatly simplified. The concern lest the student concentrate too early and too heavily for purposes of professional preparation is diminished. The position of the instructor as taskmaster is modified. The fact that he is judge does not make him the enemy. If he be a worthy and skillful judge, the student bent on self-realization will welcome his comments and criticisms, as he does those of the athletic coach. The question of time will solve itself. However brilliant the student, however rapidly he learns, he will be in no hurry to leave so long as the environment is stimulating and he has a conscious sense of growth in power. He will be neither time-serving nor time-saving, he will be growing in power and gaining the satisfactions that conscious growth will bring.

Some of you doubtless have by now identified me in one respect with the recently rediscovered man who floated through the air with the greatest of ease. Instead of proceeding grandly down from precedent to precedent you may feel I go nimbly up from levity to levitation. This is no program, you may say, for all American youth. Granted. For how many? I do not know; it has never been adequately tried. But the obligation of the liberal college is to bring freedom only to those who can stand it.

The obstacle has not been want of ability, but want of will, want of incentive, want of direction. We have confused the student by offering what we could not deliver, and by failing to offer what we are equipped to provide. If now we have the moral and spiritual force to state one true objective with vigor and persuasiveness, we have no means of knowing how many will respond. What have we offered? "General education," we have said. It is a feeble and vapid expression. It reminds me of Todd Duncan's song in *Porgy and Bess*, "I got plenty o' nuttin' and nuttin's plenty for me." "Survey courses," we have said,—a rapid summary of things already summarized in high school. A "sample of science"—but who after small boyhood wants to collect samples? "Preparation for real life"—but has not life begun at seventeen, and when will it be more real or more exigent than in those post-adolescent years? So we have gone on talking about everything except what the student is profoundly interested in—himself. We have asked him to put on a cloak of knowledge, and he does not like the pattern. It is out of style. Let us openly make the appeal which matches his dearest and most secret ambition—to be a significant person, physically, intellectually, emotionally, spiritually.

ECHOES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

I THINK we had our greatest meeting in New York. The topics covered were most timely and the presentations were clear and explicit. I shall certainly want reprints of some of the addresses.

I INTENDED saying when I saw you last week that I was greatly impressed with the entire program of the Association meeting and that I am hopeful that some of the addresses when published might be put out in reprint form.

I FELT that I wanted to write and express my personal appreciation of the benefit that I received from the program this year. It seemed to me that perhaps there was a little more that came directly my way than on some other occasions.

THE BRITISH COLLEGE*

A. E. MORGAN

PRINCIPAL OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY

I ASSURE YOU that I am not unconscious of very great difficulty in speaking to you this evening immediately after you and I have listened to the impressive address which the President has just delivered to us. It is an introduction which to some might be an inspiration, but to those of less stern stuff it might be somewhat quelling to the spirit.

You have listened and I have listened with respect, with admiration, to the challenging and stimulating remarks on this great problem of education, on the subject of human material with which we are all concerned, and I feel personally as if I should like to bow to him and to go away and think about it. Perhaps you would regard it as somewhat discourteous in me if after you have been good enough to invite me to come from the neighboring country of Canada, I should fail to make a few inadequate remarks on the subject of which I have been asked to speak.

The subject itself is somewhat alarming, so alarming that I fear it is essential to commit to paper the instructions which I received from your adequate but in some ways peremptory Secretary, who instructed me to address you on just a very small topic—the essential features of the procedures which have distinguished English colleges in preparing men for social leadership. (Laughter)

After hearing that that is in the nature of a heresy if practiced, should we agree with the distinguished President to whom we have listened, you may imagine that my sense of weakness before my task is somewhat unpleasantly emphasized.

The sense of inadequacy is also enhanced by the fact that I come from a country where it is perhaps not quite so frequent for those who pass from the University portals to come out in a Doctor's gown.

It would hardly be decent, I suppose, for anyone to accept the headship of an academic institution in this country if he were a mere Master of Arts, let alone, as I am,—and I confess it to you with due shame and blushes,—one of those Masters who have been

* Stenographic report.

referred to by the President who was assumed by the effluxion of time to have continued his studies sufficiently after his bachelor's degree, to have been awarded his mastership on a consideration which, if I remember aright—it is many years ago—was fifteen guineas.

But I will at any rate say this, Mr. President, that you cannot in my university get a doctorate for fifteen guineas, let alone twenty-five dollars. (Laughter)

The difficulty of my task is still further increased by the fact that there is no such single thing in England as a college, and therefore, it seems to me that my terms of reference fall to the ground to such an extent that I should almost be excused for returning to my chair.

When you speak of a College of Liberal Arts in this country, you know what you mean; but in England that term is not used. I am not going to suggest that there is no training in the liberal arts, but we have no specific institution which is dedicated to that function. A college may mean one of many things. Perhaps I should be forgiven, Mr. President, if I were to explain one or two things which that term may connote.

We use the term college as applied to a school, to a school for boys and girls—what you would call a high school—as, for instance, when we speak of Eton College, and refer to a school for boys before they reach the state even of immature manhood. But when we come to the university level, to the college level as you understand it, then the word college in England is used as so many terms in English institutions are used, without precision and with many kinds of connotation.

In Oxford and Cambridge you have universities which are bodies concerned with very little more, in the first instance, than examining, though in latter years the function of teaching by the university has become more and more important. There is, however, within those universities, a number of colleges, as you know, and the college is the real educational home of the undergraduate, responsible for him in his comings in and his goings out, responsible for his moral discipline, responsible for caring for him, for giving him housing and food, and also to some extent, to a decreasing extent, for his tuition.

When you come, however, to the University of London, you find there a number of colleges such as University College, Kings College, Queen Mary College, Birkbeck College, and so on, and certain colleges for women. And there you find institutions which in a sense have imitated the Oxford college but in another sense have imitated the universities, the modern universities which have grown up throughout England during the last half-century.

Each of those colleges in London, a vast institution it may be of one or two thousand or more students, will in itself be a multi-faculty institution, training not only in the liberal arts but giving those university preparations and disciplines for the professions: it may be in medicine, law, and so forth.

When you come to the University of Durham in the north of England, you have something which is modelled rather in the fashion of the Oxford college.

Then in Wales you find, on the other hand, a university for an area, the whole of the principality of Wales, consisting of four colleges placed in different parts of the country, each of them a multi-faculty university in microcosm, carrying out its teaching and joining with the other colleges to form the university as an examining and degree-conferring body.

There is yet another class of college which is known as the university college, not to be confused with a particular college in London which is called University College, or a particular college in Oxford called University College, Oxford, but university colleges existing in certain towns—there are five of them in England—which are organized again very much as the larger colleges in London and the universities in the provinces, aiming to some extent at multi-faculty organization but with this limitation, that they do not confer degrees but prepare students for the degrees which are conferred by the University of London under what are known as its external, as distinct from its internal, regulations.

I am quite sure, ladies and gentlemen, you have not followed all that, but if so, I have succeeded; because what I wish to imply is that "there ain't no such thing," as has been said, as a College of Liberal Arts in the United Kingdom, and I have left out Scotland. But as I said before, there is such a thing perhaps

as a belief in and an attempt to deal with that great problem of the inculcation of the liberal arts, and I think it may be said that in some respects Great Britain has made a real contribution through the ages to this problem of developing education of a liberal kind.

I feel that what I wanted to say has very largely been traversed in better fashion by the speech to which we have just listened. As I said before, I am sure we have been moved by the challenging words in which that speech was phrased. And when I say it was challenging, I mean that it was of sufficient importance for us not all immediately, I imagine, to agree with all of it, and I am perfectly sure that the President would feel that if everybody agreed with it at once it would not have been worth saying, because as Ruskin said of books, we should not go to them in order to find echoed what we believe in, but to find something which we could not think of ourselves and which when we hear it we might not at first readily accept.

And so if I were to speak in a somewhat different vein on the same subject which the President has dealt with, he, I know, will forgive me and will not for a moment imagine that I am merely trying to contravene his very great pronouncement.

His speech, I think, has brought to a head that great controversy which has been brought to a head again and again throughout the ages, and which it is well to have frequently brought to a head, that controversy in one sense important and in another sense, perhaps, unreal, between the relative claims of what in our modern jargon we call the cultural and the vocational purposes of education.

From the beginning of educational effort until now, there has been a constant wavering of practice as stress has been laid more on one side or on the other. In a certain sense, I suppose, we might argue that the Platonic theory of education was to a large extent vocational, that the purpose was training those men who should be able to manage the *πολις*, the society of which they were to become the governors.

My terms of reference cover the procedures which have distinguished English colleges in preparing men for social leadership, precisely the function which Plato put before himself when he was propagating his educational ideas. And although the

President has laid great stress on the importance of education from what we may call in our modern phrase the cultural point of view, referring as he did to the fact that education had validity only within itself, that its purpose was the development of the individual and of the personality, and the possibility of giving scope to the expression of that personality, yet I feel sure that he would not for a moment wish to suggest—in fact I think he made it clear that he had that other idea in mind that we must consider at the same time—that beyond the individual there is the society of which he will be a part. But quite rightly he laid stress on the fact that there is no regeneration of society except through the elements of personality and individuality which go to make up the greater whole.

Now I think that one of the reasons why in modern times more and more stress has been laid upon the social function of education is to be found in the social developments, in the changes of the complexion of society which have taken place during the last century and a half, as a result of those developments of a scientific and mechanical age which have revolutionized the whole face of man's environment.

If you will look back to the sixteenth century you find there stress laid more on the purpose of education as the development of the individual. If you will read Italian or the early Tudor theories on education, you see particular stress laid on that cultural function. But the nineteenth century has complicated society, has made our civilization so intricate that the relationship of individual to individual has become more important or, should I say, a more obviously important matter than was true in a simpler and less highly mechanized, intricate age.

Furthermore, this same period of the last century and a half has added immensely to the content of knowledge. If we look back on the functions of the universities in the Middle Ages we are bound to note the comparative simplicity of their problem. It was the duty of the university to introduce youth to *scientia*, to knowledge.

It would be a bold man today who would undertake to introduce youth to knowledge, and I think that therein lies one of the great differences between the problem as it exists today in our new, mechanized, and complex civilization, as compared with

those earlier days when knowledge was limited to such a very much smaller, narrower confine.

Even in those early days the introduction to knowledge was regarded in no small degree as an introduction which would enable the man to enter on an apprenticeship through which he would learn the technique of that particular work which he was going to do as a member of society. Society then needed in its simple fashion its civil servants, if you will call them so, chiefly lawyers and churchmen, and it needed physicians. Those professions at any rate stood out many centuries ago, and it was the function of the university to lay that foundation of knowledge which would equip young men initially, so that on the basis of this initial equipment there might be built a more elaborate technique through the process of apprenticeship.

Gradually the universities took upon themselves the function of giving that technique themselves. Law and medicine began to take their share in the curriculum of the medieval university, but it is only when we come to the nineteenth century, when this new, intricate age has come upon us, that we find the universities including many schools of a technical kind beyond the liberal arts, the inculcation of knowledge, of *scientia*. And so we have had emphasized the difference between those two functions, the functions of the colleges of liberal arts, or those parts of universities which are concerned with liberal arts, and the further work of the universities and technical schools whose function it is to equip men and women with the necessary skills to take their part as workers in society.

At the same time there is such a multiplication of departments of knowledge, that selections are necessary. And if we now turn to England we find that during the last century, at least, it has been the practice to emphasize the quality and intensity of intellectual discipline, even at the expense of breadth of knowledge.

The development in the English universities of what is known as the honors course is, I think, highly characteristic, and the theory underlying it is the belief that if you engage a young man's mind on a narrow field under rigid and intense discipline, you are giving an exercise of an intellectual kind which is of immense value. But there is, *per contra*, a very real disadvantage, and I myself am one of those who feel that in the English

universities today there is an unfortunate tendency to narrowing the curriculum, with the result that even in our universities, indeed, even in our schools, we are training experts who are learning more and more about less and less. They are digging so deep a furrow in this process of intense study, and whilst they are but lads they are so deeply sunk in the line of their own interest that they are unable to look out of their rut and see what the fellow is doing in the next one.

I regard that as being one of the very serious problems which is facing English education today. It is possible, in fact, for a boy to pass his matriculation examination at about fifteen. He will then take what is known as a higher school course, and he may pass that examination when he is sixteen. In that case he will probably go in for the same course again and take the same examination with rather better results at seventeen, and I have known of cases where it has been done for a third year at eighteen.

Now what is it that is happening during that time? If that boy is leaning toward what we call science he may be concentrating on mathematics and physics and doing very little else in fact, although he may be doing some literary study in theory. He is striving, perhaps, after the rich rewards of the entrance scholarships of Oxford and Cambridge, which are the narrowest of all scholarships in the English universities, with the result that you have a boy at eighteen or nineteen going up to the university who has been working to a standard of a very remarkable kind, say, in mathematics, but who definitely is uneducated, and after his full university course still remains uneducated although he may get the highest mathematics honors which the university can give.

Now that may seem a very drastic thing to say, but I say it soberly because I believe that it is one of the serious problems which the English universities have to undertake today.

One of the things which I admire immensely on this continent is the immense stress which is being laid in terms which we have heard tonight on the importance of that fundamental education which is given after a boy leaves school, before he enters on these more technical disciplines of a professional kind. And yet, when we look at the system in England, we have got to take cognizance of the fact that England has turned out from her universities men who have been most magnificent leaders of society.

member, surely, that the young man, and the young woman, who comes under our care has got all those immense human possibilities of individual personality which need to be given the opportunity to flourish, as we have had emphasized this evening, but that if we are going to leave it there we are going to be untrue, I think, to our function of making them realize that their personality can be only incomplete except in so far as they realize that we are members one of another.

It is only in so far as we contribute to the labor of society in its fullest and richest sense that we can enjoy or exercise that membership, and that we can enjoy and exercise our own individual personality. So that really those two problems are one, those two aspects are only opposite sides of the same shield, and all the time we have to be exercising our minds and striving to adjust our judgments and our practice so that the emphasis shall not be laid too strongly on the one or the other function of education.

Still we are left with this great difficulty, that if in the colleges of liberal arts, or those parts of the university in the English system which are concerned with that same problem, we are really to equip the young man in a preliminary fashion, so that he may equip himself still further with the elaborate skills that he will need in his profession, we have once again, I think, to get back to some common stock of knowledge as the educational foundation.

Far be it from me to suggest a uniform curriculum. At the same time, remember that the strength of the medieval university lay in the fact that it did initiate the undergraduate in the simple, elementary parts of knowledge. The *trivium* and the *quadrivium* have gone, but I feel that we must get something in their place.

I am distinctly nervous of our tendency, at any rate in England, to take our boys and girls as they come from the schools and go up to the universities, and make them into inadequate, squinting little experts. (Laughter and applause.)

This is no easy problem, and I am going to offer no simple remedy, but I must confess that I find it difficult to realize how any individual will be capable of playing his part as a leader of society unless he has had some insight into certain elementary subjects, if I may use that terribly scholastic phrase. How can anyone play his part unless he has an intimate skill in his own

language, spoken and written? How many boys and girls come into the university, or even go out of the university, able to speak, to write or to read? I don't mean running your eye along the page—we can all do that. Again, if I may return to *Sesame and Lilies*, you will remember how Ruskin says that good books are like gold mines. You can pick stones up without labor, but to get gold you must toil and sweat. Such is reading.

Surely our own language and all that it means, whatever our language may be—French for the Frenchman, English for the English-speaking, Italian for the Italian-speaking—the linguistic media of our own culture surely are fundamental to a liberal education.

We must have some skill in reckoning, because if we do not we cannot move about the world. It is a necessary technique of modern life to be able to do a little arithmetic, as much as it is to understand the rule of the road. It seems to me to be practically essential.

And then, in this world which is conditioned so largely by all the development of modern science, both physical and biological, with the immense changes that have taken place in the last century, surely no one can be regarded as fully educated unless he knows something about the principles and the elementary facts which modern society must recognize as the very condition of its existence.

Then, surely, we must know something about human development; history, not as it has been taught in the past but as the record of the development of human society and human manners and human modes of thought. Surely that, also, is an essential of the liberation of the mind of those who are to become leaders of society or even to become adequate members of it. And I would add, lastly, if not as an essential at any rate as a very desirable addition if we are in any sense to become citizens beyond our own parish, that we should have enough knowledge of the culture of at least one other people through the medium of a foreign language.

I cannot understand how anybody can be regarded as educated in a liberal fashion unless he has those minimum requirements.

Now English education is not doing this. As I have said, specialization is becoming more and more intense, but educationists

in England are becoming, on the other hand, more and more conscious of the danger of this, and I see signs, I am glad to say, of a turn of the tide. There has been recently the introduction of what is known as the General Honors Course in certain English universities. So great had been the kudos of the old honors course as it was called, which was really a specialist course, that anything in the nature of a "pass degree," as it was called, was scowled upon, with the result that every student aimed at taking an honors course, and he would rather run the risk of getting a third-class honors degree than a good general pass degree.

But certain universities very wisely have recognized that the discipline of an intense specialization, whilst it may be good for some, is not good for all, and that it is better for others through their university period to cover a wider field; and to them there has now come the encouragement of the possibility of taking honors in what is called the general course in perhaps two or three subjects.

That seems to me to be thoroughly sound, and one of the most hopeful signs that the tide is turning against this excessive tendency to specialization.

One of the great troubles in the English system has been the invention of that terrible thing, the Bachelor of Science. I cannot understand why anybody ever wanted to invent that term. If chemistry and biology and astronomy are not arts, what are they? In my university you can be a Bachelor of Arts and you may have studied the arts in one of many forms, including mathematics, chemistry, natural sciences, and so forth. It is good for Dublin, it is good for Oxford and Cambridge. But London, I believe it was, that in an ill moment invented the term "Bachelor of Science," and practically every university except those I have mentioned has run after it, with the result that you have this unnatural, deleterious dichotomy between arts and sciences, as if they were two things. It seems to me there is nothing which is wanted more for the rehabilitation of the liberal arts in England than the reintegration of knowledge, or, shall I use an older term, the arts.

You in this country have not fallen from grace in that way; you have kept that term in your colleges and universities. You have realized that the arts have a unity in the sense rather of the

ancient term of *scientia* and there you have maintained, I think, an idea wholly sound towards which I should wish that the English universities might return. But I know they are going to have a very great difficulty in doing it, and vested interests are such that I see little likelihood of its being achieved.

Now, sir, I have dilated at great length, and very simply, I am afraid, and I have dealt with what is certainly familiar to you. I have brought down this educational discussion from the very high plane to which you lifted it to these practical conclusions. But if I have done so, I have done it only at the behest of one whom no one would dare to disobey. I have inadequately enough tried to show you some of the things which perhaps English education has contributed. I have also tried to show you some of the shortcomings which I see, and some of the hopes which I also feel of a return to a fuller understanding of the essential necessity of a liberal education in the full sense, if we are to enable the individual to develop himself in the way the President has told us we should, and if also we are going to enable him through a development of himself to develop the society to which he belongs, and through his contribution to society to develop his own individuality.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE FROM THE STANDPOINT OF ADMINISTRATION

WALTER A. JESSUP

PRESIDENT OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF
TEACHING

PRESS dispatches, alumni news, presidential addresses—all give abundant testimony to the current activity of the American college. We are advised from Washington that the Federal Government has accepted more than 1,600 institutions as eligible for recognition by the National Youth Administration. Hundreds of communities have extended the high school offerings to include a junior college. Three-quarters of the normal schools have become colleges. Many new colleges are being established. Internal changes abound. Harvard has announced a new school for training in the field of public service on the graduate level. Yale has made provision for general studies in the graduate school. Teachers College announces the Advanced School of Education. In the Middle West we hear of the Chicago plan, of the Minnesota General College. In the South, Florida has adopted the general college idea. In the Far West there is likewise the same fanfare of change. More than three hundred colleges have agreed to set aside their entrance requirements for an experimental group of upwards of thirty so-called progressive schools. These activities on the part of the colleges are evidence of academic ferment. It is not surprising that there is reported an increase in college students this year. Some of these changes are fundamental and will have influence. Many of these changes represent a definite conviction of the importance of improving the job. Others are purely window-dressing; they involve nothing more deep-seated than the rearrangement of the pages in the catalogue or a new description of old courses in the current patter.

The college president who is called upon to administer an educational institution in these exciting days finds himself pulled and hauled in various directions. I am reminded of one of my friends who last year was so beset by the pressures of the world that he expressed a willingness wholly to reorganize his college

around a social core. He was almost convinced that history, English, mathematics, philosophy, and languages should be exchanged for courses on current social values. Indeed, he was wondering whether or not the students were profiting by anything his college had to offer except in social studies. All this contrasts sharply with another executive who is administering his college with little emphasis upon the *materials* of the curriculum. He considers the *quality* of education the important thing. It will be admitted not only that the resources of a college include its facilities of materials and men but that these will be modified by its traditions and philosophical outlook; in a college the imponderables can never be ignored.

The earlier classifiers of education were impressed by the variations in the numerical factors that could be used to describe the school. Their requisites differed as to length of the academic year, length of semesters, length of hour, "student," clock, or whatnot, number of hours, number of recitations per day, number of recitations per week, number of courses to be offered, the amount of work recognized for graduation, the number of A grades given in a class, the teaching load, number of Ph.D.'s on the faculty, size of endowment, the manner of keeping the records, the number of departments, and countless other phenomena that could be described in terms of arithmetic or algebra.

As one might expect, all this arithmetical reckoning has led to much counting of noses. The fact that the typical student is admitted to college on the basis of his record in a secondary school has brought about almost universal classification of secondary schools. With the system of units and credits, affecting the admission and transfer of students, there has evolved a vast network of accrediting and standardizing agencies constantly at work upon the task of making and revising lists of schools and colleges that are approved for one or another purpose. Lists have been statewide, regional, or national in character. For the most part, standards have been set up by voluntary agreement. Standardizing agencies and inspecting staffs have had tremendous influence in persuading the public to a belief in measurable "standards," and in getting such standards regarded as essential to first-class education. It is hard to exaggerate the coercive pressures of these voluntary inspectors

upon the schools themselves. Pity the president who has to announce to his constituency that his institution has been removed from some approved list!

Certain studies made within recent years lend color to the belief that we ought not to be too well satisfied with mechanical standards that are so easily measured.

In the Foundation ten-year study of 30,000 high-school and college students in Pennsylvania there has been found wide variability among institutions as well as students. After giving ten-hour examinations which included reasoning as well as memory, Dr. Learned reports that institutions equally well accredited vary enormously in their success with students and with the growth of enduring knowledge on the part of students. This difference holds not alone as to different types of student attracted by the various colleges; some colleges are very much more successful than others in dealing with students of the same, or similar, ability. Not only did the level of attainment differ among colleges but the individual performance of the students in any college varied so widely as to make it seem imperative that *some* attention be paid to this difference by the institutions themselves; for example, 10 per cent of the high school seniors ranked with the upper half of the college seniors in some colleges. The lowest 25 per cent of the Pennsylvania college seniors secured scores below those made by the upper 25 per cent of the high school seniors. Had students been graduated on the basis of enduring knowledge rather than 120 credits and four-year attendance, many seniors would have been denied diplomas in favor of freshmen, sophomores, and juniors who were superior in this particular to the lower two-thirds of the seniors. These differences may have been due to physiological limitations in reading ability as has been noted by such students as Horn, Gray, Gates, Dearborn, and others, or to lack of interest, or to lack of some other essential capacity. But, whatever the reason, it is certain that such divergence in college classes presents a problem that cannot be permanently ignored.

The Chicago plan, the Swarthmore plan, the Goucher plan, and many others that are being tried out are evidences of a recognition of the situation. Surely, as the facts become known, no college will ignore the need for looking deeply into the problem of variability between individual students.

Dr. Marcia Edwards has just completed at the University of Minnesota a study of the records of nearly 28,000 graduate students enrolled in eighteen recognized graduate colleges, including Chicago, Princeton, Yale, Stanford, and Michigan. Each institution cooperated with Dr. Edwards by reporting the records of each student, first as to whether or not his work was satisfactory; second, as to whether or not he secured an advanced degree. The records of these students were then distributed on the basis of the colleges from which they had graduated, and the undergraduate college rated accordingly. Dr. Edwards found little, if any, difference in the performance of students in the graduate colleges who came from obscure, unaccredited colleges and those who came from the fully accredited institutions.

She then re-distributed this material to find out whether there were differences in performance in the graduates of the normal schools or teachers colleges from those of the liberal arts colleges or universities. Here again there was no appreciable difference.

She then distributed the list on the basis of whether or not the students had graduated from colleges on the accredited list of the Association of American Universities. Here again, there was little appreciable difference. Only 15 per cent of the one hundred colleges whose students performed best in these eighteen graduate colleges were on the approved list of the Association of American Universities, whereas twenty-three of the one hundred institutions that stood lowest *were* on the approved list. While such a comparison is not a final measure of the college, yet it must be admitted that a place on an approved list is likewise not a basis for any great amount of satisfaction.

Let us direct our attention to an approved list on the secondary level. The University of Iowa has, for a number of years, conducted a statewide high school examination. More than three hundred schools, registering over sixty thousand students, have voluntarily given these examinations from year to year. Since the examination is given to every pupil, it is easy to find the relative standing of the school as a whole. The schools thus rated by the performance of their students were distributed on the basis of their membership on the approved list of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Here again it was found that there was an overlapping of more than 90 per cent in performance.

Thus it is evident that if schools were to be measured by the performance of their students on the secondary, the collegiate, or the graduate level, the present systems of accreditation leave much to be desired and indeed tend to conceal many differences rather than reveal them. Certainly we should strive to get a better basis for classification than we have been using.

At the present time there is in progress a study on the use of library books on the part of college students. It was found that last year, in one of the highly regarded colleges of the country included on most if not all approved lists, more than fifty of the students did not withdraw a single book from the library. Wide differences were revealed in the use of the library by students under different instructors. It was found that only eight thousand books were withdrawn from the library for the use of 800 students or staff—this in the face of the fact that the institution is the possessor of a library of one hundred thousand volumes and is pushing vigorously for more books on the theory that this is an essential need.

Such reports as these could be multiplied. They are enough to suggest, however, the administrative danger of resting our case on the less significant but easily ascertained numerical phases of college. We respond to the pressures that are easily defined and to the response devote so much time and energy and give so much official consideration that it is easy to miss the thing for which the college is created and is maintained. The philanthropic foundations; the Social Science Research Council, the National Research Council, industry, and the Federal Government are all maintaining aggressive and effective centers of education or scientific inquiry, but all these agencies are for the most part dependent upon the personnel that the college provides. They need competent men; the world needs competent men. What are we to do to help these individual students attain their full intellectual and personal development? Our present system of accreditation was based originally on the theory that the things emphasized were essential. Certainly every change that has been made in the standards has been introduced on the assumption that, as the institution attains new standards, the institution will improve, and that the product will improve with the institution.

Why do we not transfer our administrative attention from THE INSTITUTION, with its four-year straight-jacket and its external standards, to the students themselves? The students are the integrating factor of the system. Why do we not recognize more fully the variability that exists among the students who come to us from the secondary schools? There is ample scientific proof, to say nothing of our common observation, to drive home the fact that the year-class divisions, as they are at present constituted on a time and course basis, are well nigh meaningless in so far as they measure interest in learning and actual working knowledge, to say nothing of the wide diversity in special abilities which limits the students' capacity to profit by the classification which the college now provides.

Many colleges have already taken radical steps to meet the situation. The problem is being attacked at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, and Stanford; in Minnesota, Iowa, Florida; at Swarthmore, Bennington, Bard, Buffalo and Lawrence. In addition to these well-publicized examples, hundreds of colleges are trying to bestir themselves in this direction. The fact that three hundred colleges have agreed to accept special students from the so-called progressive schools is a case in point. How the college is to maintain its integrity by rising above standards that are external and irrelevant is a problem that must be faced if we are to discover new standards closer to the heart of genuine education. What is the college for? Is it an end in itself or is it an agency that can be justified only as it constantly perfects its adjustment to a clear purpose? So many of us are beset with operating problems of one kind or another that we are more or less continuously promoting our institutions instead of critically considering their function. We find that the public understands the conventional standards and can be brought to join in an attempt to conform to them. The public understands what it means to be added to or dropped from some approved list. With the short tenure of college presidents, it is not surprising that much of the time and attention of an institution is directed toward the standardizing agencies. Thank Heaven, there are indications that there is a change. Doubt is wide spread about the significance of the unit and credit system. All sorts of proposals are being made that imply a willingness to take account

of greater light. For the most part these proposals for change involve recognition of the needs of society and of the student himself.

Many of the attempts to use the liberal arts college for vocational purposes have been disappointing. Increased specialization and the need for more knowledge as well as for greater maturity on the part of beginners in the various professions, have brought about the development of a vast number of professional schools—medicine, law, theology, engineering, agriculture, and the like. With the increase in the demand for the secondary teacher with the master's degree, it is possible that much, if not all, of the so-called professional work in education for secondary teachers may be shifted to the graduate level. This would give the college of liberal arts in the future a better chance to maintain itself than it has had in the past, since roughly one-half of our graduates in liberal arts teach. The number of schools of journalism and business now at a graduate level may relieve the liberal arts college of still more of its vocational pressure. There is also a tendency to place schools of art and dramatics on a graduate basis. Not a few colleges have operated for such a long time under these shifting pressures that they have perhaps forgotten how to organize their work with any clear objectives of their own. From the standpoint of survival during an agitated period of growth they may have been justified, but with new alignments in education—the expanding high school, the junior college, and the vocational school on a graduate level—they will be compelled to take stock of their own place in this new scheme. Just what is the college field?

With the growth in the junior college, many four-year colleges find themselves with relatively small freshman and sophomore classes and a corresponding increase in the upper division. With a rise in the average maturity of the student body, amounting to some two years, there will come the need for selecting a staff capable of stimulating minds whose knowledge is more advanced and exacting. As Dr. Suzzallo said, "They will organize knowledge into intellectual vistas, which emphasize rather than exclude; into learning approaches which will permit the student's mind to move as freely as curiosity and thought impel him, down all the highways, the crossroads, and the side lanes of thought adventure and learning."

It would seem, furthermore, that this might be a time for a reorientation of the college. This may be the time to recognize the student himself as a person rather than a mere absorber of professional knowledge. For many years the college of medicine stressed rigidly prescribed pre-medical courses. But the Lowell Commission on Medical Education has advised against such early specialization. Indeed one of the most influential medical educators has recently advised his pre-medical students to take less science and more humanities, history, music, art, and travel, and the other things that contribute to an interesting personality. A recent symposium on preparation for engineering resulted in an agreement that industry was set up to provide the special application of technical training for engineering with little practical difficulty. Representatives of industry expressed the hope, on the other hand, that they might receive from the college men better trained in the fundamental sciences and in the humanities. In short, they were asking for broader, richer, and wiser personality. The law schools are very generally expressing a preference for students with an all-round general training. All these trends are grist to the college mill.

It is a far cry from the first American college, with its immature students, its small faculty, its simple, rigid curriculum, to the wealth of educational opportunity that is now provided for students who are much more mature. Even as late as during the second quarter of the last century, 40 per cent of Harvard freshmen were fifteen years of age or less, 13 per cent were fourteen years old or younger. The early curriculum, from the modern point of view, left much to be desired. Its core was language and language and more language. Not only were undergraduates limited to this type of instruction but they were orally and publicly examined. The questioning and the disputation of commencement days were high lights in the whole affair. These were comprehensive examinations with a vengeance. Until recently we have almost abandoned these except at the end of the training for the doctorate in philosophy. In those days ability to satisfy stringent examiners as to intellectual mastery of much learning, attendance of four years, and a blameless life were the essential hurdles that confronted the candidate for the first degree. Today we hear much of the importance of so changing our under-

graduate course that the student may have, on the one hand, more familiarity with the conflicting issues in our social and economic life and, on the other, a better knowledge of science to enable him to live in a scientific world. This all seems very simple and convincing. Nevertheless, our own founders, the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the designers of the Constitution, were for the most part college graduates who during their immature years in college were fed a steady and exclusive diet of languages which for practical purposes were almost as dead then as now. Yet these graduates, according to a carefully documented study of Father Walsh, led a political revolution that rocked the world. They studied Latin, Greek, Hebrew, literature, history, and philosophy, rather than material recommended by a Social Science Commission. They defended their right to graduate by disputation in Latin rather than by participating in open forums on social problems as advocated so convincingly by our contemporaries. They revolted and risked their necks thereby. They set up a constitutional government that has outlasted any of its time. Not only were they able to reach an agreement as to the statement of a constitution, but they included provision for the orderly change of this document so that it has remained in force by amendments and interpretation for one hundred and fifty years. The early college supplemented this simple curriculum with the closest oversight of the morals and manners of the student. The early rules emphasized the fact that the institution felt a keen responsibility for each student as a person in the sight of God.

Three centuries of growth is evidence of the vitality and the success of our venture in higher education. Colleges have to this day exemplified their sense of responsibility for students. Witness the new housing schemes and tutorial devices. To this day the best colleges have emphasized serious teaching. Just now we are witnessing a revival of comprehensive examinations that bids fair to be accepted everywhere. The efforts of the long-established and powerful universities to break up the lockstep in admitting, classifying, and graduating students are highly significant. We are on the way toward a generous recognition of individual differences among students and are showing a willingness to accept the consequences of such recognition by either excluding

incompetent students in some institutions or by drawing them off from the conventional courses to specialized programs such as are found at Minnesota and elsewhere. The Chicago plan provides for constant reclassification of the students who are admitted by an individual adjustment which conforms to each student's interest and capacity. Progress is marked not by conformity to credits and hours but by comprehensive examinations.

To the casual student in this field or to inexperienced college presidents these changes may spell confusion. On the contrary, they represent in reality a disposition to evaluate the situation in which we find ourselves, in the light of our increased knowledge; and a determination to maintain the integrity of the college by assuring ourselves that the students admitted are prepared to profit by it and that our treatment of them is the best that we know. There is abundant evidence that the problem of the arts college is not confined to America. John Murray, Principal of University College, Exeter, has recently voiced the English problem thus:

The confiscatory sociology of the present times has laid a heavy hand on the universities as organs of use and advantage. The early universities examined and certified for one career only—that of the university teacher. The modern university is expected to teach and certify for any and every form of work. The old primacy of the Arts Faculty, the citadel of the university spirit and of humanism, is gone. The spread of scientific specialization and of the technologies has been too much for the old spiritual leadership. At the birth of the new universities there was, besides utility, a beatific vision to be realized. There was, but it is utility that now bodies itself forth in a thousand forms, and holds the eye and the will. A prodigious usefulness has submerged the universities.

To sum it up, an intangible essence is lost, or in danger of being lost, an essence of which the idealist is assured and the utilitarian doubtful or disdainful. A university is like a man: it may gain the whole world and lose its own soul. Some institutions can be completely soulless and completely serviceable; but not a university.

These tendencies and risks are not confined to England.

A university that loses its soul loses the best part of its claim to freedom. In this hard world men and institutions

are seldom accorded more freedom than they need, and often less. The new specialists who crowd the universities need less than the old humanists whose ghosts haunt the quadrangle. Any dictator might see his chance in the present state of the universities that have sold themselves to utility. If the universities have lost their humanism, or the prophetic and magisterial tones in preaching it, need a dictator hesitate? From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

The future of each and every college will be determined by its ability to *find its job*, to undertake only as much of a program as it can carry on honestly, to select students who can profit by its resources, to leave to other agencies everything else. Fortunate will be the college which can include in its inventory of resources a few really great persons as teachers, men and women actually worth knowing because of the ripeness of their scholarship and the richness of their lives. Superior to any particular forms and limits of organization, it is the currents set in motion alone by such an influence and atmosphere that can effectually meet the demands of a diverse and exacting student body and worthily maintain the traditional glory of the American college.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IN THE COLLEGES

CHARLES F. WISHART

PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER

I AM FORTUNATE, indeed, in that my task this morning is not to settle a discussion, but to start one. Extended experience on a college campus has shown me that it is relatively much easier to start something than to settle it. As I understand the assignment made to me, it is to open the discussion upon an awkward and perplexing set of problems which have arisen among the various interests involved in the training of teachers for our public schools, both elementary and secondary. For in the last decade-and-a-half a series of frictions has evolved within the triangle, one leg of which represents the cultural college, another leg the normal school, or teachers' college, and the third leg the educational control now exercised by most of the states. If not the eternal triangle, it has been, to many of us, an infernal triangle, containing a whole area of questions, some of which are yet unsolved and many of which seem almost insoluble. I cannot deal with it on the basis of expert, specialized knowledge, but only as one who has had certain first-hand contacts with its practical phases in the great State of Ohio, a state which always takes its politics seriously, which is either blessed or cursed with an over-plus of colleges, and which has, today, the proud distinction for the first time in American history, in that it has no promising presidential candidate to present!

Perhaps it might be well to have a little glimpse at the backgrounds of this problem. In the early history of America, there was no such thing as teacher-training. This idea evolved long after cultural-college training had become the accepted order of things, at least for a selected few. Teachers in elementary schools were chosen largely upon the basis of their ability to keep from being thrown out of their schoolrooms bodily. Early in the last century, however, a movement began, looking to the better training of elementary teachers and the normal school came into existence. The first of these began in Massachusetts about the year 1839. These were mostly state schools, and the training offered was of the most rudimentary order. It consisted, for the

most part, in a review of elementary subjects, the three "R's," with some few additional frills, together with courses dealing in a somewhat primitive way with the teaching of methodology.

Long before this time, as I have indicated, the cultural college was flourishing. Harvard celebrates her tercentenary next September. Other institutions along the Atlantic seaboard had long since developed traditions and grown ivy. These colleges were mostly on religious foundations, having, for their main objective, the training of young men for the ministry. They dealt, largely, with the classics, the humanities, a touch of literature and philosophy, and an infinitesimal smattering of the sciences. Grudgingly, at first, the latter disciplines were admitted to a very small foothold. Now, it may be added that the physical sciences are securely lodged in the best living room, while the classics camp by sufferance outside the back door. Nevertheless, the aim of these colleges was—and at least professedly continues to be—an all-round cultural training, with vocational or professional subjects kept well in the background. These institutions, that is, the liberal arts colleges, had not only no relation to the public schools, but, apparently, no desire for any such relation. Their aim was the sending out of educated men with broadly balanced culture. They not only failed to serve the public schools by any articulated program; they did not even see them. They dwelt in lofty isolation and cultivated Olympian calm.

It was, perhaps, inevitable, human nature being what it is, that these two types of institutions, grown up without any planning or coordination, making their way with inadequate financing and under pressure of keen competition, should have developed a series of misunderstandings, criticisms, and heated friction. To use the phrase of Tacitus, they were separated by "mountains and mutual animosity." They hurled at each other the epithets that Carlyle puts in the mouths of the medieval schoolmen, "A curse upon you for your theory of irregular verbs." The cultural colleges felt, perhaps, like patrician old families when a noisy family of upstarts with, nevertheless, a good deal of physical capacity to get things done, moves in next door. With the cultural colleges a certain *hauteur*; as we put it in the vernacular, "high hat!" On the part of normal schools and teachers' colleges, a pushing and aggressive sort of enter-

prise which scoffed at the older disciplines as outmoded and impractical.

And yet, without any planning or centralized coordination, the two types of institutions have, I think, been gradually approaching each other. We have seen the normal school leveling up to the college and even to the university. Cultural disciplines have been slowly, but steadily, added to the earlier meager curricula. Along with a review of elementary subjects and training in methodology, content courses of more or less solid values have been introduced. While some normal schools still send out students with only two years of work preparatory to teaching, many have gone on to the granting of a liberal arts degree. In the decade from 1920 to 1930, teachers' colleges granting degrees of this sort increased from forty-six to 140. In the State of Ohio, within recent years, two institutions have been made liberal arts colleges by action of our all-wise Legislature, and are competing through free tuitions against the privately endowed colleges in the northern part of the state.

While the normal schools and teachers' colleges have thus been progressively leveling up toward the cultural standards, the cultural colleges, themselves, if I might use the term without offence, have been leveling down, perforce, to the vocational and professional functions of the teachers' college. And this, for the very simple reason that while in the earlier day the cultural college could not even see the public school, it came to the point, of late, when it must choose between serving the public school or losing a substantial portion of its own constituency. During a portion of the same decade to which I have alluded, 45 per cent of the graduates from 119 liberal arts colleges went into teaching. Ninety-three per cent of these took professional courses, and 60 per cent of them took teacher-training. Thus, while these two types of institutions have been gradually approaching each other in their functions, it has been by no means a loving approach. Neither side has been quite willing to join in the old Psalm:

Behold, how good a thing it is,
And how becoming well,
Together, such as brethren are,
In unity to dwell.

The friction continues even while the natural evolution of events has brought a measure of association and assimilation. It is

charged, on one side, that the teachers' colleges give only lip service to cultural ideals. It is charged, on the other side, that the average cultural college deals in education courses with its tongue in its cheek and I suppose some of the faculty do. More than thirty-five years ago John Dewey said:

Consider the training schools for teachers—the normal schools. These occupy at present a somewhat anomalous position, intermediate between the high school and the college, requiring the high-school preparation and covering a certain amount of college work. They are isolated from the higher subject matter of scholarship, since, upon the whole, their object has been to train persons *how* to teach rather than *what* to teach; while, if we go to the college, we find the other half of this isolation—learning *what* to teach, with almost a contempt for methods of teaching. In this division between what to teach and how to teach, each side suffers from the separation.

And the event has proved that Dewey was a wise prophet. For the cultural men allege that the teachers' college is hopelessly inadequate so far as the balancing disciplines are concerned, and elicit the retort courteous to the general effect that the cultural colleges are now furnishing neither good liberal arts education nor good professional education.

Let us now consider the third leg in the unholy triangle. We have already seen that, with no love lost between them, these two types of institutions have been at least approaching an enforced assimilation. The very friction and criticism have been a stimulus on both sides. They have provoked one another, if not to love, at least to good works. The pressure of competition has been very keen, and has not been confined to football. But the real assimilating factor, or at least the most important one, has been the intervention of the state. We have witnessed an awakening sense of responsibility for its public schools in the state itself. It is perhaps fair to say that the original pressure in this direction came from extra-legal sources such as the North Central Association. With this awakening public sense of obligation regarding the training of teachers, there came a transfer from local to state authority, not of the selection of teachers, but of their proper certification. If my information is correct, only the State of Massachusetts still leaves the certification of teachers to local authorities. This state still holds, in theory at least, to the

idea that you had better raise the general level of intelligence among local school directors than hand the certification of teachers over to a bureaucracy at the state capitol. May I, in passing, note this rich and delicate irony, that this state which leaves the certification of teachers to local school directors must needs exercise its centralized authority to see to it that the professors in Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are loyal to the flag! Now without stopping to discuss whether this centralizing tendency has been a good or a bad one, it has at least been subject to certain legitimate criticism. Whether prescribed by law, or, as in my own state, committed to a state superintendent of instruction, with the advice and counsel of the general board of education, the system has often put teacher-training standards in the hands of, shall I say, somewhat unimaginative and occasionally tactless men under heavy political pressure whose only estimate of a properly trained teacher was quantitative, rather than qualitative. This general observation should not apply in all cases, for in personal contacts with three superintendents of instruction in the State of Ohio, I have found these gentlemen both reasonable and imaginative, and quite sympathetic with the cultural as well as the vocational training of teachers. I say this because I expect to have to go back. Indeed, it is fair to say that there is an increasing tendency toward specific demands for cultural backgrounds for certified teachers. In New York, for instance, these demands are quite exacting, even including classical languages. In Indiana and West Virginia, almost equally exacting cultural standards are set up. And it should be borne in mind by those of us who belong on the cultural side of the fence that we are not the only ones having our troubles with the state. Our brethren on the other side of the fence are learning that so far as the state may represent the Divine Will, "Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth."

In a word, I cannot see the situation as one which justifies calling hard names or indulgence in mutual recriminations. That never gets anywhere at any time under any circumstances. Personally, I was born with a fatal facility for seeing the other man's point of view. It has been a great handicap. Was it Sidney Smith or was it Lord Brougham who said, "I only wish I could be as sure of any one thing as Tom Macaulay is of everything." There is a very definite sense in which each of the parties involved

in this triangle has a good case. You remember the words of the chorus in the *Mikado*:

For I am right,
And you are right,
And all is right as right can be.

But while we may not indict personalities or impute motives, while we may recognize a situation that has grown up without the planning of anybody and, perhaps, without the fault of anybody, it remains true that there are certain imminent dangers in the situation, as well as certain maladjustments which must be ironed out for the sake of all the interests involved.

For one thing, I sense a real danger in a cultural prescription to our colleges by the state. It is true that such prescription is, thus far, altogether quantitative, and in normal times there need, perhaps, be no fear that it would ever go beyond that. But these are not normal times. Fascism is in the air. And it might conceivably be only a little step from the quantitative prescription to the qualitative one. Especially in history, economics, sociology, and even in general literature, the state might begin to say not only "how much" but "what kind." History is dealing very kindly with the late William Jennings Bryan, and I suspect his figure will grow larger as it recedes in perspective. But I knew him in that unhappy little episode when he became entangled in the field of theology, which he did not understand, and when he undertook to say that the state should enforce upon the schools certain theological views. He said to me, "The hand that writes the pay check is the hand that rules the school." I know that this splendid American, excited about something he did not understand, failed to realize the implications of such a remark. My Scotch forefathers would have battled to the death before admitting that the state could control the theology of the schools, at least of the church school. They called it Erastianism, and to them it was evil, only evil, and that continually. The pressure is no longer from the theological angle, but from the social and political one. But we need to be on guard lest the precious heritage of academic freedom should be encroached upon by a growing educational paternalism on the part of the state.

The cultural colleges feel, and rightly, that any situation which, out of a four years' course, allocates nearly one-sixth of the time to vocational or professional studies, is intolerable. Of the nineteen professional hours required in the State of Ohio, only ele-

mentary psychology might be deemed of large general cultural value. Some would even question this about a very young science just feeling its way, and perhaps just a little feeling its oats, a science which Dr. Carrel has frankly dubbed "pseudo-science." But pass by that point. The bulk of these requirements are in studies which critics hold to be often trivial, to overlap each other, and to take up time desperately needed for solid content work. Of course, the proponents of education courses reply that effective teaching involves attention to those trifles which Michael Angelo said mean perfection, that certain overlappings are beneficial psychologically, "line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little." Regardless of the merits of this perennial faculty debate, it is certain that in many cases the cultural colleges are sacrificing their content work, with a result that they are more or less justly under the indictment of furnishing neither good cultural nor good professional training.

Another intolerable aspect of the present situation is, that neither type of institution engaged in the training of teachers has ever been properly geared into the public school system of the state. This applies to the normal school as well as to the liberal arts college. A centralized authority lays down upon all of these institutions a mandate for the training of all teachers who expect to receive their state certification. Yet the state does not reach down to the local school boards to enforce a reasonable cooperation in a teacher-training program. In other words, the state orders bricks to be made without the slightest provision for furnishing the straw. The courts, in many states, have expressly ruled that even the tax-supported normal school has no place in the budgets of the public school system. The normal school and the college, alike, are thus compelled to go into local politics, sometimes, to placate or to subsidize in order to carry out practice and observation plans in the high schools. Either that, or else those institutions which have the facilities, the money, and the population, have been compelled to set up little schools of their own where sometimes there are more teachers than pupils. But surely the state, by subsidies or by mandates, might make a place in the public school system by which the college or the normal school could carry out its educational requirements without embarrassment or unreasonable expense.

It is still further objected that under the present system the technical professional requirement is entirely too rigid. It ought

to be made, too, more elective; it ought to be made more flexible, so that one who has proved himself, as we say, a natural-born teacher, would not be hampered by mere technical regulations. I understand that Professor Millikan has recently said that he could not secure state certification to teach physics in the State of California. Arthur Compton could not get certification, I am quite sure. Surely men and women who have given proof of their ability to teach, either in private schools or on the college level, should not be hampered by a regulation whose professed purpose is to level the standards up and not to level them down.

Is there any way out? For the cultural college on a private foundation now muddling along on a very unsatisfactory basis there seem to be only two ultimate alternatives. The first would be to abandon the training of teachers entirely. This would entail a loss both, I think, to the college and to the public schools. To the college, because it would face the loss of considerable student constituency which, in these days, is not to be sneezed at. What is ultimately more dangerous is, that the college would lose its alumni contacts in the secondary schools. And this would be a very serious matter, indeed. What would become of our football teams? But, speaking more soberly, it would represent a very real loss to the colleges, not only from the angle of recruiting students, but also from a sympathetic relationship to an understanding of the problems of education on the secondary levels. It would isolate the college from democratic contacts. Even more fatal, I think, would be the results to the public school system if all its teachers went out of institutions whose first aim was technique and whose secondary aim was content-training.

The other alternative is, I think, a uniform M.A. requirement of all teachers in the secondary schools, and the frank adoption of a five-year course for teacher-training in all institutions alike. Hard-pressed through these bitter financial storms, many good colleges are fearful of attempting this experiment unless it is enforced upon all alike. Perhaps the prestige of superior training and outstanding personal products would be such as to make this economic fear entirely groundless. At any rate, your speaker is of the opinion that this must be our ultimate goal. It will not solve all our problems, but will go, I believe, a long way toward the solution of some of them. Having solved these, we shall probably blunder into new and equally insoluble difficulties. But we shall at least have had some real fun during the process.

SOCIAL PROGRESS AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION

CLEMENT C. WILLIAMS

PRESIDENT OF LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

THE ARTS COLLEGE is generally recognized as being the mother institution from which professional colleges have sprung. It frequently happens in the biological realm that the dam is forced to adjust somewhat to accommodate her offspring as the latter grows up. We should be neither surprised nor disturbed, therefore, if the mother college is compelled to modify her educational occupancy to make room for her growing progeny. Hence, if my remarks seem to suggest such a modification, the suggestion carries no element of parental disrespect.

Social progress has imposed certain modernizing demands upon engineering education on the one hand and a need for a reorientation on the other. The former relates to the adjustment to the changes in economic systems and to the higher esthetic standards set by an advancing social taste, while the latter relates to bringing social and political institutions into phase with our highly developed technologic and economic systems.

We mean by social progress any improvement in social institutions which enables groups and peoples to live together more successfully. Whether or not there has been discernible progress in laws, literature, and customs has been debated, but we do recognize unmistakable progress in technology,—a world-wide communication by telephone and radio, a swifter and more flexible transport, improved sanitation, a network of power lines that turns night into day and eases physical burdens—which has wrought profound social changes and formed the basis for more advanced economic agencies. Hence, any education aimed at further social progress must interpret its objectives in terms of technological progress to a certain degree. The arts college, more and more contributing those elements common to all types of education and thereby affording the matrix in which the more rigidly required professional courses are imbedded, has a responsibility for directing higher education toward social progress.

May I expand this thesis somewhat, first with reference to the *direct relations* of the arts college to engineering education and second with reference to the *indirect relations*.

The skeleton structure of engineering curricula took form largely in the last third of the nineteenth century following the passage of the Morrill Act. That was a period of relatively rudimentary engineering science and practice, exemplified by railroad surveys through undeveloped regions, simple bridges, low buildings, largely rule-of-thumb design, steam engines of 200 pounds' pressure, low voltage, direct current circuits, and local telephones.

Paralleling that primitive stage of technical development, the economic agencies were correspondingly elementary, consisting of local plants in manufacturing industries, public utilities limited to the home city, separate coal and metal mines operated as distinct units, uncoordinated railways as the only means of distance transport, local merchandizing, and local banks.

The situation today, both in technical operations and in economic organization, stands in marked contrast. In the technical field, continuous and other types of long span bridges, eighty story buildings, arched dams, refined stress analysis in structures and in machine parts, superstrength alloys, high speed cutting tools, steam turbines at 1400 pounds' pressure, high voltage transmission, electronics, radio, television, interconnected power lines, world encircling telephones, paved highways, automotive vehicles, aviation, and universal electric illumination.

The accompanying economic organizations are correspondingly complex. Railroads grouped into large systems grimly struggling for survival in competition with other agencies of transport, far-flung public utilities united under holding companies, industries united under supercorporations or confederated in associations, manufactures integrated with materials and distribution concerns, communication coordinated into a few monopolistic groups, and commerce drifting into the control of chain stores. These developments in economic agencies are not only concomitant with, but they are the fairly direct result of, technological improvements. The late George W. Perkins pointed out that the large corporation and the holding company are the direct product of the telephone which permits officials to communicate

immediately with each other over long distances, and chain stores are largely made possible by rapid and flexible transportation which permits efficient centralized purchasing and storage.

This situation reveals the first of these modernizing demands upon engineering education, namely, that it be adjusted to its new environment. Whereas, a training in extracting raw materials and other elementary techniques sufficed as the basis of the curriculum a generation ago, it is insufficient for this day because of the advance, not only in technical procedures, but also in the economic systems to which engineering operations are inextricably related. In the older day, technical training led through an apprenticeship to a fairly definite professional life, while today, because of increased complexity, fewer and fewer technical graduates find their training a specific preparation for the vocation which they subsequently follow. The demand involves, therefore, more than a training to perform certain operations; it is for an education that affords versatility in the face of changing economic and social conditions. The acme of technical education hereafter will be an equipment for a possible vocation plus an accessory preparation to shift to any of the variants thereof or to its economic correlatives.

The natural prescription by an arts faculty to effect this desired versatility and adaptability would come readily enough, namely, to include more arts courses in the engineering curriculum. To the engineering dean's query as to which courses, the reply would come with equal readiness: Just add modern languages, history, political science, sociology, biology, literature, psychology, logic, etc., etc. On investigation, however, the engineering dean frequently finds that the only course available in any of these branches is a basic course designed as fundamental preparation for those who expect to proceed to a major in the field. Moreover, this initial course is taught by a graduate assistant or other tyro whose grasp is limited practically to the text-book. Furthermore, this tyro insists on reciting the contents of the text and calling the recital a lecture. Is it surprising that the engineering dean declines to follow this offhand prescription?

Courses should be taken as nutriment to yield mental growth, not as medicine to cure intellectual deformities. The inclusion of further arts courses of the ordinary garden variety in engi-

neering curricula is futile unless by reason of content and mode of presentation they are integrable with the broadening scope of engineering education itself. At the risk of being dubbed apostate to scholarly ideals, I wish to commend the use of such books as Wells' *Outline of History* and his *Science of Life* for prospective engineers and other non-specialists. The expanding universe of knowledge compels the hanging of more pictures of the great quests and adventures of mankind where details are subordinated to a sense of perspective, even though completeness is not attained at every point. If the arts college, therefore, is to supply this accessory need in engineering education, it must make special provision sufficiently integrable with engineering curricula to furnish the element of adaptability desired.

Let us now turn to the second demand of social progress on engineering education, namely, a higher esthetic standard for engineering operations.

The old curriculum of a half century ago was little concerned with esthetics. Then the urge was toward utility and low cost. With the tremendous increase in wealth through technologic operations, a consciousness gradually awakened that utility and economy could be supplemented to bring greater satisfactions by introducing certain esthetic considerations, the chief of which are beauty, cleanliness and quiet.

Mr. Smith is no longer satisfied with an automobile that will transport him cheaply where he wishes to go; he desires one of pleasing outlines, free from rattles, smell and dirt. A half century ago, elevated railways were built with tracks attached to the structural framework producing a huge sounding board that magnifies train noises. I sometimes wonder how much longer the inhabitants of the large cities will endure the din of elevated railways when it could be largely eliminated by silencing procedures. A generation ago the ugly parallel chord truss bridge was a prevailing type; today steel and concrete vie with each other to produce pleasing structural forms. Today, higher social standards are requiring streams to be freer from pollution, wires to be removed from poles in the streets and placed in sub-surface conduits, smoke nuisance to be abated, and street noises to be mitigated.

In this second, or esthetic, demand upon engineering education, the arts college can cooperate not only directly in developing canons of taste for esthetic treatment, but also in cultivating such an appreciation of esthetic values on the part of the general public as will induce a willingness to assume the additional cost required to add beauty, cleanliness and quiet to plain utility.

We now come to the counterpart of the foregoing discussion, namely, the re-orientation of social science instruction to be in accord with the advances in our technologic and economic systems so as to lead to further social progress.

Paradoxical as it may seem, perhaps the application of engineering to social progress lies quite as much within the purview of the arts as of the engineering college. While the arts college through its pre-engineering courses contributes directly towards engineering education, its equally great opportunity to promote the effectiveness of engineering education in social progress lies in acquainting all who come within its sphere of influence—teachers, writers, business and professional men—with a correct interpretation of a civilization that has been recast to a great degree in a mold of technology. Naturally, the departments of social science are those most directly involved.

In this area it is commonly stated that political science is founded on history, but is the history that is commonly taught the most significant history, or is it largely a hold-over from out-moded writers? Does it give proper emphasis to man's constructive events, or is it too largely emotional? Naturally, as an engineer, I note especially the neglect of technological influences. For example, the day after tomorrow will occur the bicentennial of the birth of James Watt. The achievements of James Watt have affected human affairs more profoundly than have those of his famous contemporary, Napoleon Bonaparte, yet the rare mention of the former as compared with pages devoted to the latter certainly conveys an incorrect conception of their relative importance. What historian notices the discovery and introduction of coal in the ninth century A.D. as a dividing event between ancient and modern life? While pages are devoted to the second war with England, which accomplished nothing and which one eminent English statesman could not even recall, the discovery of gasoline at that period is not mentioned. About the same time,

Mr. Gladstone, Oxford educated, on viewing the epochal discovery of the electric dynamo by Faraday, inquired of what use it might be! Dramatic incidents procured mention of the telegraph and the telephone on history's page, but I have yet to read any adequate notice of power machines, the elevator, or the linotype.

The observation is frequently heard that political science has not kept pace with technology, and sometimes the ludicrous suggestion has been made that science and invention should be held in check until political thought could catch up. May it not be that the failure to make social and political progress *pari passu* with technology results in part from an adherence to traditional content in history instruction together with a disposition to devote major attention to the dramatic and emotional events rather than to the rationally significant? Does not history spend undue time on the turmoils and storms of human passion that subside and leave no more trace than do the waves of a mid-ocean tempest when they sink into the calm? Correspondingly, are the articulations of the permanent factors which build up social structures sufficiently revealed? Interpretation of social experience must guide social progress, for, despite the random ventures and the roseate claims of our present national administration, political science does not admit of controlling experimental methodology.

I have been appalled at times to observe social science instruction founded on an attempt to piece together a twentieth century technology and a nineteenth century economy. Such instruction accounts for a willingness to accept the benefits of technology while absolutely rejecting the social advantages of modern economic organization, a willingness to accept the telephone, for instance, while rejecting its offspring, the holding company. While I would not for a moment defend the piracies that have been committed by unscrupulous organizers, yet informed intelligence should recognize the power and efficiency of corporate systems, and professors as well as politicians might well realize that "trust busting" was largely a tilting at windmills and belonged to a rather naive stage of economic development.

When political science recognizes that large scale economic systems are an inevitable outgrowth of technology and represent actual social progress, it will discover first, that if government

also is to keep pace, it will need to follow along lines of improvement similar to those of proven validity in the economic realm; second, that legislation which is arbitrary and contrary to economic principles is ineffective; and third, that under modern conditions, strong economic systems, rather than intricate governmental forms, constitute our best hope of national stability.

May I mention three examples of this maladjustment in political science which seem fairly obvious.

Among the many results of modern technology, the accumulation of large fortunes is notable. Neither ancient banking nor commerce ever equaled railroads, steel, petroleum, or manufactures in the concentration of wealth. The individuals involved have proven themselves socially wiser and more efficient than government in diverting these vast accumulations of wealth to social benefit, yet not a few teachers of political science present a queer lag in proposing to prevent individual accumulations and to apply a nineteenth century conception of socialized fixed capital to twentieth century technology and production.

As a second illustration, the teaching of labor problems is frequently from a biased viewpoint. A favorite preparation for teaching this subject, in addition to academic training, is some experience as a tramp laborer passing from one industry to another, seeking the laborer's viewpoint and the inside of union strategy. Such an experience would be enlightening if it were balanced by an equal experience as a manager endeavoring to reduce costs so that his plant could operate solvently in the face of competition. Without the latter experience, the former leads to prejudiced instruction that is not only out of harmony with engineering education but subversive to social progress.

The third illustration relates to a lack of appreciation of the influence of universal technology and economic organization in world politics. Modern industry has spread its corporate organization, like a plant with runners, taking root in foreign countries. We have a world of political boundaries predicated on horse-drawn vehicles, carrier communication between individuals, and eighteenth century conflicts, which is entirely out of mode with a world encircling telephone, world-wide radio broadcasts to which all who will may listen, and aerial navigation. May not enlightened economic systems supplant much of international politics

and thereby promote social progress when political systems, like economic, become adjusted to modern technology?

Therefore, without professional vainglory, it seems to me fully as important that education in certain departments of the arts college be adjusted to the effects of technology as that engineering education be adjusted to a traditional cultural content, which, like Atlantis, is largely legendary.

In conclusion, engineering education is more than a museum of interesting fragments of learning; it must be a coordinated and integrated whole, like a well designed structure, with each part properly proportioned and efficiently related to the other parts. Arts courses may not justifiably be incorporated in an engineering curriculum unless they are integrable in such a unified project. A sympathetic understanding of the social significance of technology by the departments concerned in the arts college will not only advance engineering education, but it will align the engineering college with the arts college in the further march of social progress.

I BELIEVE that our educational effort would be more productive of good results if we were more willing frankly to admit that our students will still have many things to learn after graduation, which they can learn while on their jobs, and that we had better devote relatively more effort in training them to handle with judgment, skill and resourcefulness, situations typical of those to be met in high-grade positions in their later careers. In other words, as students mature under our tutelage, we should treat them less and less as sponges or computing automatons and more as men with a divine spark of creative genius which we try to discover and fan into a flame.

I am, of course, using the word 'research' in a broad sense to signify any attack on a professional problem whose handling calls forth creative effort, and not merely reproduction of some one else's procedure. In my experience as a teacher, no other educational approach compares with this in bringing out those qualities of interest, enthusiasm and independence which we desire above all else to stimulate. To be successful, however, it must be done well. It is not an approach suited to mass production of graduates or to a mediocre group of students. It requires extraordinary skill and resourcefulness on the part of instructors, a resourcefulness that can exist only if they themselves are active in developing the frontier territory of their profession.—*Annual Report, 1935, Karl T. Compton.*

SOME MODERN TRENDS IN LEGAL EDUCATION

PAUL BROSMAN

ASSISTANT DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF LAW, TULANE UNIVERSITY

I THINK I should say that, I am not speaking with reference to developments in any particular law school. In fact, I shall talk wholly of an entirely mythical and non-existent institution—the member school of the Association of American Law Schools. This body is known to you, I am sure, as one of the country's two standardizing agencies for legal education—the other being the American Bar Association's Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar—and as the only one expressing the point of view of the university educator. You will recall that it was founded thirty-six years ago as an off-shoot of the American Bar Association's Section, and that at the present time it contains eighty-two member schools—virtually all of the full-time institutions in the United States, and certainly all of the important ones.

With the gradual disappearance of the practitioner-teacher, or at least his relegation to the substandard, part-time school, the growth of an *esprit de corps* in the pedagogic branch, the approach of the saturation point in the practice, the beginnings of a science of law in America, the growth of the case method of instruction, and the marked improvement in staff compensation in law schools—to mention only some of the factors which doubtless operated reciprocally as well—a different sort of person came to man law faculties. Always a law school product, he was in the usual case the holder of degrees in arts or science and the graduate of a national law school, where he had come into contact with the best of his trade. Increasingly too, of late, he has engaged in graduate study, where he has come in touch with legal systems other than his own, with the study of legal philosophy and with legal history as distinguished from antiquarianism. This man was not content to teach dogmatically or even to teach solely. New problems created by an increasingly complex social and economic organization were confronting the bar, and it was too busy or too much a product of its own education to deal with them adequately and to its own satisfaction. The new law teacher, who was equipped

with time, training, ability, detachment and social awareness, demanded a hand in their solution and got it. He was peculiarly fitted to render service in these fields, and as the value of his contributions and his potentialities was realized he assumed new proportions in the respect of the public and of the profession. Today, although he is not the lion he was when his abilities were first recognized, his position, I believe, is secure as representative of the youngest, albeit an equal, branch of a tripartite profession.

I think you will agree with me that a similar improvement has taken place in the regard in which the law teacher is held on his university campus. The qualities which earned for him a place of standing in the arena of affairs and in the profession have gained him the recognition and approval of his university colleagues—without which, of course, his improved status elsewhere would have been an empty satisfaction. At the present time his services are being utilized in a wide variety of capacities by the institutions of which he is a part—including in several recent instances elevations to university presidencies.

It would be a false pride which would prompt an apology for this reference to the law teacher's new status. It is and should be, I think, a source of gratification to all members of the guild. It has been mentioned, however, not for the purpose of indulging in self-congratulation, but to pave the way for the suggestion that without the courage born of self-respect, which the law faculty has come to have, it would never have ventured the self-criticism, the revision of its programs and the experimentation which in recent years have come to characterize it. As one law faculty member said a year or so ago in speaking of the rise of this phenomenon, "The law professor could (now) criticize his own curriculum without caring for the aid and comfort it gave to the opposition." Consequently, while the full-time law teacher's rise to respectability has exerted relatively little direct effect on recent trends in teaching, it is submitted that its indirect influence has been enormous.

Before Dean Langdell introduced the case system into the Harvard Law School, the pedagogic method in use in law schools everywhere had assumed one of two forms in the main: the lecture system, or the use of legal texts or treatises which were to be read by the student in preparation for the class, and were used

by the instructor as the basis for oral examination, eked out and elaborated at times by illustrative and other materials. The case method was something new under the sun. Indeed, a well known American professor of law has recently referred to it as representing "the most original and unique contribution as yet made by the United States to educational progress in any field." It was calculated to send the student direct to what were thought to be the raw materials of the law—and to what were actually at the time, at least, those which predominated in the Anglo-American system—the cases. Under its theory the student did for himself that which theretofore had been done for him by the lecturer and the author of the legal treatise, that is to say, he extracted legal generalizations from the cases—historically the primary materials of the common law. Despite its defects—and many of them did not become apparent, or even exist, until significant changes had taken place in the American juristic scene—it did constitute a marked improvement in pedagogic technique. At the same time it operated with other factors to which attention has been called elsewhere to remove the practicing lawyer and the judge from university faculties in the main. The case system not only required thought on the part of the students, it required additional thought and time, intelligent organization, and a new technique of presentation on the part of the teacher. The practicing lawyer could not ordinarily afford the time for such teaching with its penalty of elaborate preparation. The result of this and other approximately contemporaneous phenomena was the full-time university law teacher, of whom Dean Ames may be said to be a superior example for the early period. The practicing lawyer and the teaching judge remained principally—although not entirely even yet—with the part-time, substandard and frequently proprietary law school which continues to exist today, although its importance from the numerical standpoint as well as from that of prestige and public approval is considerably diminished.

What is the present status of the case-method in American legal education? To generalize briefly, it is believed that although the contemporary law teacher recognizes it as the tremendous improvement it was over previous methods of law school instruction, and although he regards it as retaining a measure of pedagogic validity, and as constituting one of a number of tools in the smithy

of legal education, to pervert Maitland's phrase, the period of his intense preoccupation with it has come to an end. In truth, this process of departure has been in motion sub-vocally and at times, at least, unconsciously for much longer time and over a much larger area than is commonly supposed. Six years ago in a review of Professor J. H. Landman's book, *The Case Method of Studying Law—A Critique* I used the following language in describing the method's degeneration which expresses the present point of view.

The reviewer, in fact, has never been entirely comfortable in discussions of the case method. He has never been able to feel sure that he knew just what sect was under fire. But of one matter he has felt reasonably certain—that not for several years has the Langdellian method, pure and undefiled, been practiced by any considerable number of the most effective teachers in law schools. They may have known they were heretics and boasted of it. They may have realized the enormity of their sin and practiced their dark rites in secret groves. Or they may have been quite oblivious to what they were doing: having seen that their teaching was ineffectual, they merely took steps to improve it—without realizing that they had stepped beyond the pale. And their variations may have been but slight. The point is, however, they have varied.

To-day, however, the revolt against the case method—at least that one which Langdell knew—has become both articulate and self-conscious, and on occasion militant. Not more than a month ago, for example, I was advised by an eminent member of the faculty of law of an Eastern university in connection with the preparation of the annual report of the standing Committee on Curriculum of the Association of American Law Schools, to inveigh against the device, and to urge member schools to “throw it in the river.” Articles have been written in disapproval of it, and reference has already been made to one volume dedicated to the thesis that the case method is unscientific, and what is worse, that it is bad pedagogy.

Reference must be made to some, at least, of the factors operating to produce this repudiation of the case method, although little more than an enumeration is possible under the circumstances. The wastefulness of the method in the time of both the individual student and the class is undoubtedly a factor, although one which

alone would not account for its decay. The growing liberalization of professional legal study must also be mentioned—a part of which involves an increased recognition of law as one of the social sciences and the resultant and proper incorporation of a non-legal social science content into the legal curriculum as well as into the individual law course. Partially because of this latter attitude it seems to have been more completely realized that the method is essentially a professionally introspective and an intellectually provincial one, and one calculated to create a similar set in the mind of the student. The enormous growth of legislation as a form of law in the Anglo-American system, and the gradual but prophetic decay of the doctrine of *stare decisis* are certainly important—if not the most important—causes. And, finally, reference should be made to the growth some years ago—and variously interpreted and characterized—of a behavioristic approach to case law. Manifestly the Langdell method cannot survive if the student is to refuse to heed what the court says. This factor was doubtless referred to by Professor Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School in a recent review of Professor Robinson's book *Law and the Lawyers*, when he said:

Increasing attention has been paid of late years to the fact that laws are not impersonal objects like the standard yard kept under glass in Washington, but modes of action by judges and other human beings with limited thinking powers and a variety of strong emotions.

And law has even been defined by Professor Llewellyn of Columbia in substance as the conduct of the officials of law administration. Although, in my opinion, this heresy has now been reduced to the level of the content of sound but obvious truth it contains, it unquestionably operated some years ago in connection with other causes to produce the defection of the case method.

What instructional devices and materials are now being used in our law schools? There can be no question, despite what has been said, that cases still constitute the primary instructional material in the American law school. Two observations are to be made concerning this statement. In the first place, it should be said that there has been no suggestion that the case method, even in the strict Langdell sense, is no longer used. It should not and doubtless will not be completely rejected, and it is still used and

should continue to be used to a considerable extent—and especially in the instruction of the initial year. The student must be taught the technique of using cases, and this can be done better by Langdell's method than by any other, I believe. In the second place, much of the modern case use does not conform to the Langdellian discipline. That is, they—the cases—are used to perform an illustrative function, to furnish solutions to problems posed apart from specific litigation, or because their opinions constitute succinct monographs on narrow legal fields. But in addition to cases many new and substituted materials are being used in law classes and students' source books today, which were virtually or even totally unknown to the teacher of even a decade ago. Readings from treatises and periodical literature, of both a legal and a non-legal sort, fact problems, legislation, or even entire court records are coming in for an increasing use as classroom materials. Research projects of varying degrees of elaborateness are utilized more than occasionally, and clinical training of a legal aid, a moot court, and a drafting character is being afforded the law student in growing degree. Special reference should be made to the recently increased importance of clinical instruction, because in it may be seen an example of the triumph of the perspective which has been acquired of late by the legal educator. Naturally while the law schools were dominated by the practitioner teacher, as we have seen them to have been during the early period, their objective was an immediately practical one, and the student received explicit instruction in many of the trade details of his anticipated career. Ultimately the full-time teacher came into his own and with him came, I am afraid, a not entirely surprising revulsion against his predecessor and many of his non-intellectual ideals. One result of this, I believe, was an unfortunate failure to realize that the student, after all, was being trained for the practice of a profession and not merely in an intellectual discipline, and a concomitant neglect of many of what might have been regarded as the sordid, but inescapable, trade details and routine of the lawyers' work. The important subjects of pleading and procedure even suffered as a result of this complex, which I suspect involved a definite and not inconsiderable social loss. In short, it is charged that the law teacher of the middle period, erred as completely on the side of the in-

tellectual aspects of the practice for which he was preparing his students, as his analogue of the earlier era did on the side of the practical ones. Happily a more fortunate adjustment is beginning to come about, and it is my considered belief that today's law student is receiving more nearly a balanced curricular diet than did either his father or his grandsire.

Before leaving the discussion of the case method—by means of which it has been possible to call attention collaterally to other matters of present interest—I should like to reiterate the absence of any desire to minimize the importance of the discipline as a contribution to educational method. The gratification displayed—if any—has been not at the decay of the device although some law teachers would not follow me here, but at the termination of too intense a preoccupation with it, and at the recognition on the part of law teachers that for a considerable period the American law school, alone among educational agencies, restricted itself to the stultifying monotony of a single method. In the words of Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, delivered in the course of an address before the Congress on Medical Education, "We need to seek deliberately for wide variability in method if we expect to advance."

Reference has been made in the course of the preceding remarks to an acceptance on the part of law teachers of a conception of law as one of the social sciences and of the function of legal education as the production of the jurist, as distinguished from the "resourceful craftsman," the social engineer as distinguished from the legal tradesman. This point of view was made explicit some years ago by Dean Pound in the passage in *Law and Morals* in which he said:

Jurisprudence, ethics, economics, politics and sociology are distinct enough at the core, but shade out into each other. When we look at the core, or chiefly at the core, the analytical distinctions are sound enough. But we shall not understand even that core, and much less the debatable ground beyond, unless we are prepared to make continual deep incursions from each into each of the others. All the social sciences must be co-workers, and emphatically all must be co-workers with jurisprudence.

One of the effects of this notion has been the gradual infiltration of a non-legal social science content into the law cur-

riculum. This has come about in a variety of ways: by means of the increased use of a somewhat haphazard professorial comment, with or without appropriate references in the course of classroom colloquy; by means of directed research or required reading along the lines of the relevant non-legal subject matter in connection with regular professional instruction; through a joint handling of selected courses in the legal curriculum by a professor of law and a teacher in the related non-legal field; and through tying into the professional curriculum designated non-legal studies or groups of studies. I have sought to enumerate the various means by which this desirable result has been effected in the order of their acceptance and practice by law faculties. Some slight experimentation and more talk has even been going on in the direction of providing for a non-vocational degree in law with a curriculum made up of approximately two-thirds non-legal foundational and social science material and one-third legal material. I am vigorously of the opinion that the experiment is worth a serious trial.

As may have been implicit in what has been said, I think that there is discernible in the American law school a considerable increase of interest in research in both primary and secondary materials, as an instructional device. Much of the thing I have in mind might be referred to more accurately as fragmentary research, and is to be distinguished from elaborate work of the sort prosecuted in the course of graduate study or as a requirement for the lamentable honorary undergraduate doctorate offered in some institutions. Special research courses in current decisions, for example, are available in several schools. A growing use of the procedure is also apparent in connection with regular courses in substantive and adjective law. Moot court competitions, legal aid clinics and some of the work of the growing student bar association movement also furnish an occasion for more of the practice. And, finally, the large—from some points of view, the unnecessarily large—number of law school periodical reviews undoubtedly stimulate the production of a vast amount of student writing—much of which is extraordinarily good and may be justified apart from disciplinary considerations. As one who firmly believes in the pedagogic value of compelling the student to put pen to paper, I cannot but approve the tendency.

In my own emphatic opinion one of the most hopeful signs in current legal training—and one which stems from its dawning interest in the development of the jurist rather than the mechanism—is the growth of interest in some of what may be termed the pure sciences of the law. I am speaking here of such subjects as comparative law, jurisprudence in all of its departments, legal history, and legislation, including such phases as its place in modern law, legislative sources and objectives, its drafting and interpretation, and a realistic view of the legislative process—and I believe that a treatment of them in the undergraduate curriculum can be defended on the basis of even the most practical considerations. It is not necessarily my suggestion that formal courses in these subject matters be prescribed, or even offered, although I do not quite share the certainty of a number of my colleagues here as regards some of them. The student, however, should be introduced to them in some effective fashion—and this, I believe, is being done increasingly. Some time ago for the purpose of satisfying my curiosity on the point, I sent a research assistant through each of the annual directories of teachers in members of the Association of American Law Schools—published now for almost fifteen years—for the purpose of ascertaining the growth—if any—in the number of instructors offering formal courses in so-called pure science fields each successive year. The tabulation he submitted indicates the following facts as regards the fields referred to a moment ago. There has been a marked and steady increase in every subject mentioned, save legal history, which has barely failed to hold its own. Legislation was shown to have grown enormously in importance; comparative law was a safe second; and the formal study of jurisprudence disclosed a definite gain in the number of teachers listing themselves as offering it currently. Going outside the enumerated fields, it appeared that the subject of international law had lost ground, and that fewer courses in traditional Roman law have been offered for the past several years. The latter situation may, however, be explained on the theory that some instruction in Roman law has been refurbished and modernized and is now listed as comparative law—a quite legitimate procedure.

In concluding, I can do no more than enumerate a selection of additional matters of which time does not permit a fuller treat-

ment. The four-year professional curriculum is still being talked of, although not so much as formerly. It is, however being afforded an opportunity to demonstrate its superiority, although usually as an elective arrangement. Despite the fact that Dean Pound and other teaching leaders have declared against it, it possesses numerous supporters whose attachment is loyal and sincere.

Pre-legal requirements continue an upward trend, and each year sees at least one or two institutions hoist the minimum number of entrance hours over the two-year requirement of the standardizing agencies. It seems true, however, that one hears less talk of the necessity for the move now than obtained some years ago—and I do not regard this as due entirely to the complete acceptance of the idea. In fact, it might even be said that in some quarters, at least, it has become respectable again to question it—but for entirely different reasons. More than occasionally nowadays one hears talk of a two-four year-combination, rather than a three-three or a four-three one for the local school. This probably derives principally from a bipartite source: an increased regard for the liberalized law curriculum and an occasionally expressed distrust of the liberal arts college. I suspect, however, that the three-year curriculum will continue standard for any future worth considering this morning.

It may interest you to know that the orientation course has come to the law schools. A survey made during the past year by the Committee on Curriculum of the Association of American Law Schools indicates that from one-third to one-half of its member schools offer an initial course of an orientative character. A sharp difference of opinion as to its value exists, however, and its opponents are bitter in their denunciation of it.

The American law school, I can also inform you, is following the example of other university departments, and is beginning consciously at long last to wonder whether European faculties of law have anything to teach it as regards curricular content, organization and method. During the ensuing year the Association of American Law Schools will sponsor a series of articles by competent persons, the object of which will be to compare Continental legal education with our own. There are many who hope that this step will presage a more elaborate study of

the problem, the adequate financing of which constitutes the principal obstacle at present.

The conclusion cannot be avoided, I think, that a not unflattering picture of current legal education has been presented. I think, however—all in all—that such a view can be defended. While I do not believe that I, or the American law school, can be charged either with complacency or overconfidence, and while there is much to be done, especially on the lower levels of even the so-called standard school, before a decent minimum is met in some departments, I do believe that hope is evident in the scene as a whole. Activity and movement—and good humor—are present at any rate, and from a relative standpoint, at least, prosperity of a sort may be around some ultimate corner.

THE APPOINTMENT of four outstanding leaders in education, the theater, science and sociology as honorary fellows of Union College has been announced, bringing the total number to eleven, seven having been appointed in 1934. One of the first acts of Dr. Fox after his inauguration in 1934 was to institute the office of honorary fellow in order that outstanding leaders of the world should bring to "collegiate discussions the counsels of direct experience" and thus aid students to bridge the gap between the campus and enlarging awareness of social and intellectual trends outside." The trustees subsequently authorized Dr. Fox to appoint twelve leaders in American civilization for a term three years each.

The new honorary fellows are Dr. Frank Pierrepont Graves, Commissioner of Education and President of the University of the State of New York, Honorary Fellow in Education; Clayton Hamilton, dramatic critic and author, Honorary Fellow in Drama; Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of the General Electric Research Laboratories and recipient of the Nobel Prize in chemistry in 1932, Honorary Fellow in the Physical Sciences; and Arthur Pound, historian and interpreter of industrial America, Honorary Fellow in the Social Sciences.

THE COLLEGE IN SOCIAL PROGRESS FROM THE STANDPOINT OF MEDICINE

JOHN WYCKOFF

DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES

WHEN I entered medical school in this city in 1903 the requirements for entrance to all of the five schools in New York City were less than high school graduation and there were no science requirements. Since that time the medical schools have demanded from prospective students an increasing amount of specific knowledge. The time for this was first arranged by requiring one year, then two years, and later in many schools, three, and in some, four years of college work.

The medical schools, with one or two exceptions, were first satisfied with rather simple introductory courses in science, but soon they realized that if they made the demand for more advanced work, the students and colleges would meet that demand. There crept into the college curriculum as the result of the demand of the medical school a minimum of work calling for a year's course in physics and at least two years in biology and chemistry, besides certain requirements in English and the modern languages.

Then came the stage of competition for entrance to medical school. Prospective medical students, believing that additional science credits gained more favorable consideration from admission officers, tended to take more and more science. In many cases actual medical school science was offered for admission, particularly by those students who had not received high grades in their required science. This was done frankly by many students who hoped, by taking additional work, to gain favorable consideration on the supposition that a large but weak foundation is as good as, or possibly better than, a smaller but firm base.

In some colleges I believe this competition has led not only to an over-specialized undergraduate curriculum but also to the offering of a greater number of courses than the institution, because of lack of space, physical equipment and necessary staff, can adequately give.

With the increase in science requirements a tendency developed to break down subjects into water-tight-compartment courses. While this was a natural administrative development for which medical school requirements must in part share the blame, the result is unfortunate for the student. Even the best student finds it most difficult to realize that histology, embryology and vertebrate anatomy are taught separately as a matter of convenience to the school, but possibly inefficiently and inconveniently to the student, that is, if the object is to make him realize that the vertebrate is made up of groups of cells which develop according to certain laws. One also wonders how much needless repetition takes place in subjects when courses are given independently by different individuals and possibly with not too much coordination.

In discussing this subject at Toronto before the Association of American Medical Colleges, Professor Cannan, to crystallize the matter, suggested that the physical sciences might be taught as a single subject instead of being broken down into physics, inorganic chemistry, organic chemistry, qualitative analysis, quantitative analysis and physical chemistry. In order to be specific he outlined the following as a possible way that the physical sciences might be taught.

The student will begin, simultaneously, a study of the physics and chemistry of commonplace things. His physical approach will be through the mechanics of movement of familiar bodies so that he attains a certain facility in the translation of such common abstractions as force, pressure, kinetic and potential energy, work, equilibrium, velocity and so on. This is elaborated by an elementary treatment of the manifestations of radiant energy in its varied forms. His chemical approach will be through a relatively few simple chemical changes leading to the laws of chemical combination, the atomic molecular structure of matter and the electrical nature of atoms. At this stage, a definite detailed attempt will be made at a broad synthesis of the principles of physics and chemistry. It may be done by the logical extension of mechanics to define the behaviour of molecular assemblies. In some manner, the principle of the second law of thermodynamics will have to be introduced. Perhaps this might best be done with the aid of the probability integral. This has the merit of an aid of familiarity and at the same time permits a mechanical method of de-

scription to be maintained. There will follow a simple picture of the states of matter, the laws governing changes of state and equilibrium and also the laws of reaction velocity and equilibria in relation to energy magnitudes. The student will then return to distinctly physical and chemical disciplines directed towards widening his experience and supplementing his factual knowledge in these two fields. Finally, towards the conclusion of the curriculum, another sustained attempt at a broad synthesis of his knowledge will be made in such a way as to refine the general principles at which he has arrived and to define their present limitations. Such a curriculum will not distinguish rigidly between inorganic and organic chemistry. It will not treat physical chemistry as a special subject—not yet any of the usual subdivisions of physics. Qualitative and quantitative analysis will not be taught for their own sake but will take their place in the general laboratory experience which will be a continuing auxiliary to the whole course, illustrating techniques, instilling precision, posing problems.*

It was suggested by Professor Cannan that such an approach to the foundations of physical science, while a proper starting point for a professional student, is also a desirable experience for any man of affairs in this scientific age.

Frequently the question is raised as to how much mathematics should be required of the student preparing for medicine. Is not the answer, "Enough for him to carry on the work in medical school"? This has been defined by one teacher of chemistry in a medical school as an amount "necessary to give the student a facility in the application of the laws of proportion and a certain freedom in the use of logarithms." Are not these requirements made of any man of affairs? I wonder if most teachers of elementary science would not agree that the mathematical lack in their students, when such occurs, is lack of thoroughness in their understanding of mathematics they are supposed to have mastered, rather than a lack of knowledge of higher mathematics.

Professor Helen Sandison of Vassar, at the 1935 meeting of the School and College Conference on English, in speaking of English studies and English examinations, said, "They do exist to develop and test the power to read with a sense of reality,

* To be published in the *Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, March, 1936.

with a personal response; the power to write or speak with a sense of reality, with some personal shaping of experience, no matter how practical and non-literary that experience is."*

That students who are unable to grasp enough of introductory physical and biological science to progress efficiently in medical college should be refused admission, I am sure is a statement to which we would all be willing to agree. What of English? I think admission committees should demand as high a quality in college English as in science.

It is my opinion that most medical colleges have been signally inconsistent in their entrance requirements in modern language. My own college states that a reading knowledge of either French, German, Italian or Spanish is urged. It would seem that either a reading knowledge of French and German, the two languages, with English, in which science has been chiefly written during the past two generations should be required, or that there should be no modern language requirement. Surely the few words which are remembered by many students after their college course are of no use to them as tools and their introduction to the great literature written in those languages must have been too slight to have had any influence.

So far I have tried to discuss that part of the college curriculum which gives the tools to the prospective medical student. I have meant to make clear that I believe in the case of the average student the amount of such work taken in college should be limited but thorough and that the medical school is wise to give preference to students who have done good work in the subjects actually required rather than to those who have done indifferent work in more advanced courses in the same subjects. I have had the temerity to suggest that in some institutions the breaking up of subjects into subdivisions has been done at the expense of valuable time and with resulting confusion to the student. I have expressed my own belief that language is a tool of tremendous importance to the medical student.

In some colleges there seems to be a tug of war between utilitarian subjects and so-called cultural subjects. I am of the opinion that utilitarian subjects taught by a proper staff often

* *Report of the School and College Conference on English*, February 8-9, 1935, page 13.

prove an experience reaching quite beyond the narrow confines of the subject itself.

As to what the remainder of the curriculum in college should be, I would not be, nor do I think the professional school has the right to be, dogmatic. Medicine is intimately related to and interested in many things: the social sciences, economics, philosophy, history, literature. In the brief time remaining to the student in college, I believe it more advantageous for the prospective doctor to learn thoroughly something of one or two, rather than to skim over many.

The education of a professional man begins at birth or before and ends when he stops the practice of his profession. It is true that you and I have great responsibilities in that brief period during which this educational experience is carried on under our guidance. Is not our greatest responsibility to remember that these young people should be taught how to learn from the experience of those who have gone before, how to observe accurately, and how to reason honestly?

FRED C. ZAPFFE, M.D.

SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES

IN THE very short time at my disposal, it is necessary that I limit myself to a certain few outstanding things which I know will have interest for you.

There has been so much misunderstanding as to just exactly what the medical colleges want by way of preliminary preparation, the misunderstanding arising entirely from the fact that there never has been any contact between your group and our group, perhaps for the reason that we were supposed to be not medical educators but medical men who were dabbling in education. However, in the course of time we have learned many lessons.

We have carefully surveyed what we have done and what has happened, with the result that we have come to certain rather definite conclusions. First of all, our Association, through its Executive Council, went on record a little more than a year ago as being opposed to so-called "premedical" courses. The reason for that is that through the term "premedical," which originated

with you, not with us, there has arisen a misunderstanding as to just what that term might include, and not knowing what medicine did stand for and what medical study meant, it had a rather narrowing effect on what colleges were going to offer to these students.

They segregated these students, more or less, and gave them concentrated courses, or specially arranged courses—as to content—in each of the so-called required subjects. They did not understand just what we meant when we said that we required certain subjects; overlooking the fact that we always have spoken in terms of minimums not maximums.

More than three years ago we amended our constitution by erasing from it reference to hours, which Dr. Kelly referred to briefly, yesterday, when he said that you will delete fifteen units and one hundred and twenty hours. We did that a long time ago, as far back as 1919 when we put the curriculum on a percentage basis with much elasticity. The entrance requirements were similarly changed in 1932. We said not less than one year of biology, inorganic chemistry, English and physics and half a year of organic chemistry leaving the college to carry on from that point.

One of our feelings has been that the colleges have not carried on as they should; they have carried on as they thought we wanted them to carry on, and that has been wrong. We would very much prefer to see students intending to go into medicine stay with all the other students in the college; take exactly the same courses, and, as Dr. Wyckoff has told you, take not too much of any one thing, with the ultimate aim of intellectual development rather than the storing away of a mass of facts which could not be marshalled into an orderly array of useful knowledge.

They have been saturated in science. I have visited many colleges and universities and have often been shocked to see the courses that the premedical students had to take, especially in biology which was not biology at all.

To show you that the Association of American Medical Colleges is intending to be liberal, we have permitted medical schools, with the consent of the Executive Council of the Association, to accept students who have not taken certain subjects; for instance, biology. Students who have had good courses in psychology and in

sociology, who have been well trained in some one particular field, say in chemistry or in physics, are permitted to enter without examination in biology.

If they have had no more than two years of college, they may lack credit in one subject in which they will be submitted to examination. If they have had three years, they may lack credit in two subjects. We are trying to be extremely liberal, because, after all, what is it that we are trying to get at in laying down certain minimum requirements, and why are we trying to get hold of people who, as Dr. Kelly used the term yesterday, have been "educated and not trained?" Why do we place emphasis on "educated and not trained?" The students who have come to us with a lot of science have been trained. They have been trained like a lot of animals to perform certain tricks. They are not "educated." The students should not have had so much science, but more work in the humanities, more cultural work, more work in mathematics, in sociology, in philosophy, in psychology.

And now we are bringing into the picture a new subject which we think at the moment has considerable importance, and that is genetics. We want these people to be well educated so that they can tackle problems and work them out without being continually prodded and fed facts.

On what do we base these beliefs? Studies which have been made for the Association for a considerable number of years show that the men with an A.B. degree, for instance, stand head and shoulders in accomplishment above those who have had a B.S. degree. They have more clear records; fewer failures. That, I think, is quite significant.

Having to evaluate many credentials each year, I am particularly interested in noting with what courses each applicant has bolstered up his required science work, and there is always a certain group which fills in the time, and another group which takes some subject that is worth while.

Another rather interesting thing that we have found is this, and it has quite a bearing on standards: That the group that comes next to the A.B. men in worth while accomplishment in medical schools are the students who have had less than three years of college work. Of course, they are a handpicked lot. Each year we have about the same number of applicants out of

that group. Since 1926 we have made a study each year of applicants and applications to medical schools. Beginning in 1926, we had about 20,000 applications made by about 8,000 individuals. Last year, in 1935, we had more than 34,000 applications made by nearly 13,000 individuals. Of those 13,000 individuals, about 2,000 will be applicants who have less than three years of college work. However, taking the present freshman class in our medical schools, the enrolment numbers 6,200, which is a drop of about 600 from last year, which was very much the peak of all times, so far as my experience in the Association goes.

Of those, there are 12 per cent who have had less than three years of college work, and of that 12 per cent, only 1.2 per cent had no more than 60 hours. Perhaps some of the best students in the medical schools will be found in that small group. They are intense students.

We have often been charged with the fact that we are a rather select, a high and mighty group, as one speaker said this morning, a "high hat" group. We are not. We select more students from the less-than-three-year group than we do from any other group except the A.B. group, so that there is not any disposition shown to make it hard for a boy who for financial reasons cannot go any further than two years in college, to get into medical school.

We are trying to select those people who we feel are best fitted for the practice of medicine. The effort is rather a difficult one, and we are using many means of making that selection; scholarship, the aptitude test, personal interviews, various types of tests which individual colleges have made use of in the past few years, and always we find that there is something wrong in our selection.

Personally, I have always felt convinced that if we could get the colleges to disregard us in every way, except for this minimum, and get their students to take more of the cultural work in the college, discourage them from taking so much science, or too much science, the result would be better than it is,

Through my experience so far I have noticed that each year the mortality in the freshman classes in our medical schools is about 15 per cent. I think that is too high. Last year (1934-1935) it reached the peak of 15.3 per cent. Some of our medical schools feel that if the education (I almost said training) in chem-

istry in the colleges, were better than it is, these failures would be fewer in number. Perhaps so.

For five years I have been sending to each college which sends students into medicine, a report on the accomplishment of their students in the freshman class, and I have asked in return that they communicate to me the standing of the student in class in college—whether he was in the upper, middle or lower third—and what happened to him as far as his courses were concerned. The response from the colleges has been rather interesting. Twenty-five per cent did not acknowledge the receipt of those reports. Nevertheless, I presume they have some interest in them. But from the return of the remaining seventy-five per cent—and they have the largest number of students in medical schools—it is quite evident that there is a very close relation between scholarship in colleges and scholarship in medical school. The good are good and the bad are bad, with the usual dropping out here and there, or going up or dropping down from the curve. I have also found this, that of those students whom the college would have recommended for acceptance by a medical school, only 5 per cent failed. And of those whom they would not recommend, 30 per cent failed.

Now, then, whether that statement from the college was based on my report or not, I do not know, because often a college will write and say that this student failed because he did not graduate.

Of course, that is beside the point. He had had three years of college, but did not graduate. He probably would have failed even if he had graduated, and then they might have included his name in the "not recommended" list. But these things just run that way year after year, and what is particularly noticeable in that work is that of the approximately six hundred colleges which send students into medical school every year, nearly always the same ones have a poor record, and inasmuch as the report on this is sent to our medical schools, they can use it for the selection of students. Some colleges have already written, wanting to know what they could do, so that their students would again be acceptable to medical schools.

That work is not being done to be used as a club, nor by way of a threat, but simply to secure cooperation. There is room for

cooperation, and it is the only way in which we will ever be able to get this problem solved; to get it worked out right; to remove the rigidity of courses in the colleges. It already has been removed in the medical schools.

I was very much pleased to get a letter from DePauw University, submitting a paragraph which they intend to put into their catalogue. They are calling the attention of students who intend to study medicine to the fact that the studies that have been made by our Association have shown that those students who do not take an overload of science, and who do take cultural work and broaden themselves, do much better work in medical school, and therefore they suggest that they keep this in mind and get in touch with the dean and talk it over with him.

There is just one more important point. We have been charged with keeping down the number of medical students. That is true only in so far as it applies to proper preparation; that is, what we think is proper preparation. For instance, of these 13,000 persons who have applied each year—and during the depression the number went up and up and up, which in my experience is nothing new. During business depressions since I have been in this work, the curve in the medical schools has always gone up, and when business is better the curve goes down—but of those 13,000 applicants, we accept about 7,500. Of those that are accepted, from 700 to 1,000 fail to matriculate. They may have changed their minds about studying medicine or decided to remain in college, but at any rate they have not come, so that we have not strictly limited acceptance to numbers. The only thing we are trying to do is to get students who are better prepared to the end that we can furnish people with doctors who are better prepared to practice medicine. We are not interested so much in the number of doctors as we are in giving you better doctors.

THE LIBERAL COLLEGE IN THE TAX-SUPPORTED UNIVERSITY—REPORT OF SECTION "B"

FREDERICK B. ROBINSON

PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

SECTION "B" dealt in general with the liberal arts college in the tax-supported institution. Three papers were read and discussed.

The first paper considered the question of arranging college work so as to adjust it to individual needs arising from (a) differences in high school preparation, (b) subjective differences in students, and (c) different life objectives.

The speaker took the position that a proper arrangement of college work would be impaired by a sharp division of the institution into junior and senior college with all cultural work in the first part and all specialization in the second. Especial warning was given against preparing for overcrowded professions and training permitting persons to specialize in fields for which they were clearly unsuited.

The paper was discussed by President Walters and his comments in general paralleled those of the first speaker. He suggested that in preparing specialization courses, colleges should have the advantage of the advice of graduates in the various fields, and he pointed out that the selection of college students for entrance into college and also for admission to specialization groups should be on a qualitative rather than a quantitative basis. He also reminded the group of the importance of a rounded development, some appreciation of art and music, and especially of the fact that American colleges should prepare for good citizenship.

The second paper took up the question of whether there were aims peculiar to the tax-supported college. The speaker reached the conclusion that there is no essential difference between the aims of the tax-supported college and the privately endowed institution, though it may be true that the students of the former come from less fortunate economic groups and may incline toward fields of specialization in which the need for future support is an

evident motive. The leader of the discussion was clear in his view that there is no curriculum problem or aim peculiar to the tax-supported college.

President Phelps discussed the question of whether the aims of the college could be properly attained without some selective processes of admission and, second, whether such selective process was possible in a tax-supported college. His conclusions were that obviously any college must have some selective basis of admission, but that study should be given to method. One method is to build on the high school profile of attainments, and the other is to depend on general intelligence levels in particular age groups. He criticized the traditional method of examination which was to exclude students not likely to do the conventional work of the college. He concluded that certain tax-supported institutions might be under pressure to take all students, whether fit or otherwise, but, in general, the problem of selection is the same as in any other college.

In the discussion that followed, these points and others related to them were reinforced.

The general conclusion concerning the work of the whole section seems to me to be as follows:

(a) The liberal arts college in a tax-supported institution does not differ in any way in aims and methods from one that is not so supported. Differences may depend upon variations in student personnel and community needs.

(b) Methods of selecting students, both for admission and for particular courses should be based upon sound educational principles and not be influenced by the source of revenue.

(c) More attention should be paid in selecting the students, in advancing them through courses, and in admitting them to specialization work, to the individual needs of the students, to their previous formal education and their subjective peculiarities, and also to the needs of dynamic society as it uses its human resources.

THE FORMULATION OF AIMS THAT MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS AND ARE ADJUSTED TO CURRENT LIFE APPLICATIONS

FREDERICK B. ROBINSON

PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

THE AIMS of education are as extensive as the aims of life. Their definition is as difficult as the explanation of existence and the ceaseless strivings of humanity. The aims of education, whether consciously directed or not, are to quicken the sensitivity and receptivity of each person so that he may become increasingly aware of his current surroundings and of what has been wrought by the race over eons of time, and also to develop his creative potentialities so that he may contribute his share to the maintenance of life and to the physical, intellectual and ethical progress of all.

Obviously all life is a school and there are many teachers with manifold motives. The astonishing thing, in the confusion of counsel and the clash of interests, is that each rising generation survives the emotional adolescent period with any capacity for clear observation and rational inference and that its members succeed in finding useful parts in the human drama. But the shaping process, with its pressures and pulls does give results and every generation has its pioneers of thought and action who blaze new paths of progress. Professors of ethics discuss moral values and faculties impose formal discipline in the hope of developing self-control in their students, but the frictions of the world even more decisively establish moral scales, shape conduct, bestow rewards and mete out punishment.

The differences between the world with its interplay of activities and the school with its teacher-made exercises are these: the programs of the school are systematized, directed according to schedules and plans, and condensed so as to cover in a few years of formal instruction the acceptable garnerings of humanity's harvests over many centuries, and the motive of formal education is disinterested, non-partisan, unbiased and objective. The uncounted agencies of life without central, human direction have many motives, some selfish and even criminal, others altru-

istic; some born of ignorance or prompted by cleverly devised sophistry, others arising from trustworthy and legitimate enterprises. The only acknowledged motive of formal education is the discovery and revelation of truth regardless of its effect upon any person or group. Of course by truth we mean, in any field of thought the consensus of opinion of the most competent specialists at a particular time, accepted until modified by further research. This applies to factual knowledge, general principles, skilled processes, ideals of conduct and indeed anything that can be conceived by man. Formal education is then an especially effective and systematically directed agent in the midst of many other educational forces all of which, for good or evil, are shaping individuals and society as they engage in reciprocal interaction. Although formal education has its own techniques, it should never be remote from life; it must parallel life in matter, methods and goals; it must be just as vital and as real in its influences. Indeed, it serves as a commentator and critic of life in general, warning against this force and pointing with approval at another.

The college has its place in the scheme of formal education as a whole. In general, it must study the needs of young people who, while under its care (a) are in the age group, roughly, of from seventeen to twenty-one; (b) are, so far as available tests will show, well above the average of intelligence of their age group; (c) have demonstrated capacity for study of the concentrated sort; (d) are able to make such study their primary interest for four years.

The general aim of the college educator is to use four precious years so as to develop to the full the capacities of the students in order that they may be critical yet effective and happy members of society. We take it for granted that certain basic information useful and common to all citizens of the intelligence level of this group will be imparted, that all will be carefully trained in methods of observation, experimentation and research so that they will be able to approach new problems, gather pertinent data and reach reasonable, independent conclusions, and that they will be imbued with a sense of responsibility for integrity of thought and conduct. The broad enlightenment and discipline just indicated by partial enumeration is culture. The

prime and ever present purpose of the American college is cultural. The college must contribute to the information, intellectual tolerance and mental curiosity of all its graduates. Just now we shall not go into these matters, but rather discuss problems which arise from the facts that no two individuals are alike in all respects and that the civilization into which they must fit is ever changing—dynamic, or in process of evolution—and not static.

Of course it is clear that the content of a basic cultural course will vary from age to age. Not only will so called scientific facts of one decade be discarded as false and supplanted by new explanations of details of the universe, but the relative weight of different fields of study will be changed. More important, though, is the acceptance of the idea that methods of instruction and sequences of studies should vary with different groups of students and even individuals. To carry out this principle in practice it is necessary to section students more carefully than is done in most colleges and to vary the sequence of courses in accordance with the previous preparation, personal qualities and life aims of individual students.

It would be easy to write the aims of a college and have them accurately reflected in a curriculum if all students were alike, if society were standing still, if the birth rate exactly canceled the death rate, if the materials and processes of technical undertakings were to remain fixed and if the requirements of society for unskilled and skilled laborers, for clerks and business managers, for teachers and workers in the professions were to remain constant. But that is not the case; new knowledge, discoveries and inventions and variations in populations create ever changing demands for the readjustment of the principals, the subordinate actors, the chorus, the orchestra, scene shifters and property men in the drama of civilization. Callings for which there is a great demand at one time become overcrowded and are even discontinued within a relatively few years. It is impossible to prepare a curriculum that will be a general preparation of all cultivated people for all the places in society to be occupied by college graduates. Complex, evolving social life calls for broadly cultivated people more than ever before, but it also demands persons especially prepared to serve as trained specialists.

Colleges, in general, have recognized this and relatively few avoid the problem by saying, "We confine ourselves to a general cultural course and expect the professional schools and graduate schools to train specialists." It is recognized that for most of their students, the undergraduate college will be the last place of formal education and it must therefore not only impart something of broad cultivation and inculcate in them the capacity for further intellectual adventure under their own direction, but also prepare them for some field of work. In many colleges, the course of study is so planned as to devote the first two years to the mastery of such tool subjects as the languages, mathematics and basic courses in the natural and social sciences, while the last two are given over to specialization somewhat like that to be found in the European university. I do not consider this the best arrangement for reasons to be given later, but just now I wish to concentrate on the question of determining the aims of such specialization no matter what schedule or division is adopted.

It is here that most colleges are weak. They usually consider that a student has specialized if he takes a multitude of courses in one or two departments. Reform is needed in the direction of visualizing in the case of each student something which he is to do in after life and to keep him advised not only as to his own likelihood of success in the proposed activity, but also the competitive chance he will have of finding an opening for himself when he seeks a place. Furthermore, greater care should be exercised in determining the ingredients of his planned specialization group. This is far more difficult than agreement concerning the content of the common, cultural core.

Let us consider first the danger of preparing students for the overcrowded callings. In the City of New York there are thousands of young people who were trained to become teachers in the grammar schools and high schools, who also succeeded in passing the competitive examinations of the Board of Education and who were granted licenses to teach, but who will have to wait many years before the turnover in the personnel of the schools will make appointment possible. Such a maladjustment of supply to demand is deplorable and should not be allowed to continue. A similar situation holds for law and for those who completed scientific pre-medical courses but could not be admitted to the

overcrowded medical schools. On the other hand there is a dearth of trained nurses, laboratory technicians and educated assistants in medicine and such other fields as social welfare, chemistry and metallurgy. Broadly educated men especially trained in technology and accountancy can readily be placed in normal times and they adjust themselves to related occupations in times of depression. In this discussion I am not concerned simply with the question of the money value of a diploma, I am thinking of a sensible adjustment of human resources to social needs.

The remedy may be found in the establishment of a continuous study or perpetual inventory of the fields of employment for people of the college level of intelligence and training. Such a study and service might well be undertaken by this Association or the American Council on Education. It would serve to indicate ascending and descending trends of social demand for trained workers.

Concurrent with it should be made a study of the qualities, knowledge and skills required of those holding particular positions. It will be found that some of them fall in patterns so that a definite training would enable a graduate to qualify for a number of different places which at first glance might seem to be unrelated.

But not only do colleges send out well qualified students to crowded fields, they also permit persons to specialize for service in which they have little if any chance for success because of lack of personal qualifications. Again I take teaching as an example. The number of college graduates who completed all the necessary courses to receive institutional credit for pedagogical specialization but who are rejected by school employers because of defects of vision, hearing, speech and personality is entirely too great. The college itself, through its personnel bureau, vocational guide, medical examiner, speech department and student advisers should have made a selection of likely candidates before they were permitted to prepare for the teaching career. The same argument holds for all lines of professional concentration, though the qualities to be looked for vary with the prospective calling.

Finally the individual aim of the student and not some departmental organization should determine the ingredients of a con-

centration group of studies. The pre-medical and pedagogical groups of studies in a given era are fairly well defined. But suppose the student wishes to enter the field of investment banking. The best training for him is not necessarily a solid mass of courses in the department of economics or finance. He will need some of these to be sure, but it would be well to have him prepared also in science and technology, for money now is invested largely in technological processes. In his first job he will readily learn about the various forms of securities but he will find it more difficult, once out of college, to dig out the facts and principles of applied science. Conversely the geologist might well come to his work with courses dealing with economic resources, markets and statistics. The specialist in music needs modern languages and the art curator should be grounded in the classical languages. One could not in this paper cover all the permutations and combinations. The purpose here is merely to indicate the need for more careful study of the formulation of specialization groups in a manner different from that of merely specifying so many courses in this or that department of study. Social evolution is so mobile that we must be flexible as we draw upon the college resources likely to help a student adjust himself to his life's work.

Insisting as we do upon the cultural aim of the college, we must nevertheless be careful not to make our courses so diffuse that they are superficial. All courses must be thorough and the general background must be devised to serve not as the complete college offering but rather that part which will give a perspective of life as a whole in which the student must later play a definite and competent part. There are inner experiences of appreciation, meditation and reflection but there are also clear-cut decisions to be made in careers of action and achievement. The college must strengthen both. Indeed, action cannot be well directed without the balance of reflection, and meditation will be vague and futile if carried on by one untouched by practical experience.

Reference has been made to the device of dividing the college into a two-year junior course of general studies and a senior division of specialization. This arrangement is not desirable for the American college at this time. The failure of the extreme form of this division at Wisconsin was due rather to the ill-

advised methods which unfitted the students for solid scholarship in the specialties of the last two years rather than to the division itself. But assuming a wiser employment of the time in the completion of the training in tool subjects begun in high school and in general, cultural or informational studies, the rigid division with the exclusion of all special programs from the freshman and sophomore years, is undesirable for students who know, when they enter college, what careers they wish to follow later. It is also undesirable for the great mass of students coming, as they do, with differences in the secondary training they received in various subjects of study.

Let us assume that a faculty decides that half the degree credits must be assigned to courses in mathematics and the languages begun in high school, to English expression and to broad instruction in history, social service and the natural sciences—in short the broad background of a cultivated man. Let us assume also that it has assigned a quarter to a particular field related to the degree to be conferred and another quarter to electives which are free or related to life work. Nevertheless, the sequence of these courses should be determined by the individual needs of the students and not by a preconceived division of the institution into a junior college and a senior college. This would be true whether the propositions are those just assumed or some others.

I believe that all college students should have had a prescribed course in esthetics or appreciation of art. Such a course serves as an introduction to an insight into the beauties of nature and the manifold manifestations of artistic design in architecture, sculpture, painting and even the utilitarian implements of the home and business. Unless it is pursued in college, it will probably never be followed at all and one of life's richest sources of joy will be neglected. But for some it should be taken in the first two years, for others in the third or fourth. On the other hand, a student who wishes to pursue a general college curriculum but also prepare to be an artist, an art critic or a commercial designer, should have courses in drawing, painting and sculpture in proper sequence beginning with the freshman year. Any other arrangement would make impossible competent specialization likely to result in creative artistic work. Obviously a foreign language should continue in unbroken sequence, based on the

high school preparation until the language is mastered as a real tool, but English courses in written or spoken expression should be required even in the last two years. A basic course in philosophy is desirable, but it is most effective in the senior year.

We could take the list of prescribed courses of any college and show why certain of them must be allocated to the first two years while others should be deferred to the third and fourth. The precise arrangement in any case would be determined by the high school studies offered for entrance, the subjective character of the student and the field in which he expects to specialize. In general, where that field is known it is best to begin the ground work as early as possible. Let us illustrate with the example of a boy who, desiring a broad college education, nevertheless wishes to become an accountant. He must cover general accountancy and business law in the first two years in order that he may properly take up cost accounting, auditing and advanced problems later, to say nothing of related studies in business organization, finance and management.

It is an *a fortiori* argument for those who want to become chemists or workers in any of the applied sciences. In short, limitations of program and the need to respect proper sequences force us to the conclusion that we cannot expect to devote two years to broad cultivation and follow them with two of specialization. Rather should we regard the whole four years as a period in which adjustments must be made to the secondary school preparation, to the needs of rounded cultivation and to the personal demands for training which will be a preparation for participation in practical life.

Furthermore, the line of demarcation between so-called cultural studies and specialization courses is not so sharp as is usually supposed.

It is possible that at some future time we may evolve an educational system similar to that of France, Germany or England, in which we shall have a clear-cut division between primary, secondary and professional education. That will come only after we have produced a class of scholars for the secondary field similar to the professors of the French *lycée*. Without committing ourselves on the desirability of a new division of time between primary and secondary education, we now must recognize the fol-

lowing facts: Our college students come to us with no real mastery of any foreign language, of mathematics basic to scientific investigation, or an adequate preparation in the fundamental sciences. Even the progress made in the control of these important tools of the scholar is uneven. The college must take high school graduates as they are, continue certain studies, round out their broad cultural information, impart a scholarly point of view and prepare for some service in life.

My suggestion is that we devote ourselves anew to the task at hand and devise methods:

(a) Of continuing the tool studies in accordance with individual qualifications,

(b) Of imparting broad, cultural information in courses of proper sequence according to individual attainments,

(c) Of estimating the qualitative and quantitative demands of society for specialists in various fields.

(1) Of guiding students into special fields in which they are likely to succeed.

(2) Of guiding them into callings for which there is a real demand.

(d) Of arranging for initial studies in particular specialization groups and for later sequences in relation to the individual's needs and the technical character of the field.

(e) Of making general studies concrete by reference to applications and of using interest in special, practical processes as an incentive to wider research, reflection and speculation.

The great danger of formal college education is inertia and a tendency to formalism that becomes more and more remote from the world of working, striving, aspiring human beings. That danger can be overcome by broad gauged educators who know life and who, while not of it, are in the world. It will cease to be present when all are as well acquainted with the life about them as they are with the records of the past and when their greatest joy will be the cutting and polishing of each rough gem of humanity entrusted to their care and of setting it appropriately in the diadem of progressive civilization.

ARE THERE AIMS THAT ARE PECULIAR TO THE TAX-SUPPORTED COLLEGES?

LLOYD C. EMMONS

DEAN OF MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

I CERTAINLY do not pretend to know precisely what the objectives of a liberal arts training should be and therefore I cannot with definiteness set forth those that are especially appropriate to the state-supported college. But no one could stay long in an administrative position in a college without having some rather definite opinions on these questions.

As general objectives of liberal training I wish to set forth the following which I think have come to be pretty generally accepted:

1. The acquisition of the ability to read understandingly, to speak fluently and to write with some degree of style in the English language.

2. Such a general knowledge of the social studies as may be acquired in one or two year-courses in this field.

3. A general knowledge of the biological sciences.

4. A general knowledge of the physical sciences.

5. One or two year-courses in the field of the humanities.

6. Specialized training in one of the fields just mentioned.

If I understand correctly the intention of the distinction between the topic of the former speaker and my own, I may appropriately consider the difference in attitude toward an educational institution of individuals on the one hand who, through inheritance or hard work or good fortune, have accumulated enough to enable them to contribute large or small sums to the support of privately endowed colleges and universities, and of individuals, on the other hand, who are either unwilling or unable to make such gifts and who must, none the less, pay for the support of higher education through the medium of taxes.

Then, too, it is pertinent to consider any distinctions between the students of the endowed college and those of the publicly-supported college. If either type of college is more likely to attract students from a certain economic level or students with a definite pattern of life objectives this tendency should be taken into consideration.

May we discuss first the latter topic. It may be taken as fact, I suppose, that, for two colleges of nearly the same grade and in the same general locality, expenses for the student will be lower in the publicly supported one than in the one that is not publicly supported. There would appear to be at least as much difference as the fees or tuition of the one exceeds that of the other. Hence it seems reasonable to state that it costs a student more on the average to attend the endowed college than it does to attend the state or municipal college. Because of this fact the student body of such colleges is to a greater extent made up of those whose parents are in the lower or median income groups and who, because of their own necessity, have always kept before these young people, as a paramount goal, the acquisition of a training with a definite pocket-filling practicality. From a considerable experience with students from different economic levels, I have reached the conclusion that the concern exhibited by students over the "practical value" of any subject or any curriculum varies almost inversely as the square of the distance that his economic stratum has risen above a subsistence level. I am sure that it could be established that the vocational interest of students on the average is highest in those colleges where the annual expenses are least and that this vocational interest decreases as one moves toward those colleges where the annual expenses are such that administrative officers spend time in combatting the idea that they are rich young men's clubs.

To distill in a paragraph my impression of the average student in the two types of colleges I should say that in the publicly supported institution the student demands training that will provide him with the ability to earn a good living and hopes that he will secure sufficient culture to fit him for the enjoyment of his leisure. In the endowed college, on the other hand, the average student has the greater interest in a broad cultural training, seeks knowledge for its own sake and hopes that out of such training will come opportunity for him to do useful work in some field.

To turn now to the attitude of those who support the two types of colleges we shall have to look at average types rather than consider special cases. On the one side we have to consider the point of view of such men as the Rockefellers, Baker, Duke, Rackham and Stanford who had the means and the vision to give magnifi-

cently to establish or support colleges for the development and dissemination of knowledge of whatever nature. Such men had the vision, or had trusted advisers who had the vision, to refrain from limiting the scope of educational endeavor to be pursued under their benefactions. Hence America is blessed with a number of colleges that are absolutely free to teach and to support research in things that are "of the spirit" as well as those that are "of the flesh."

Publicly supported colleges, although not severely limited in the scope of their curricula or their research, are, however, sensitive to the mood of the mass of people who pay the taxes which support these colleges. Expediency is a word which means little to those who have not arrived at the age at which, according to Walter B. Pitkin, life begins. But it does mean something when we consider objectives of publicly supported colleges. The attitude of the average taxpayer is that the training for which tax money pays should be, first of all, practical. Whatever else it may be is in the same category as the unearned increment on a guaranteed dividend stock. And what does practical mean? Just one thing—that at the end of the training there is good prospect for employment that will provide at least a living.

This attitude of the taxpayer is reflected in the thinking of the legislator or councilman or commissioner or whoever is the elected official having to do with the appropriation of funds for the college. Such an attitude was revealed as early as 1862 in the wording of the Morrill Act which provided funds for the establishment of the group of land-grant colleges. The provision is that the monies are appropriated "to promote the liberal and *practical* education of the industrial classes in the several *pursuits* and *professions* of life." Through all the years since then projects that have a practical appeal have more easily won support than those whose relation to mundane things is less obvious. That this is a fact can be doubted only by those who have never had the task of extracting funds for operating expenses from a body of officials who control public monies.

What effect then have these differences in attitudes of students and of supporters had upon the objectives of the two types of institutions? The answer, as I see it, has already been indicated. Publicly supported institutions are more inclined to formulate

curricula that point to the "several pursuits and professions of life." In doing this they have done little more than make convenient groupings of traditional subjects in order that they may appear more definitely to encompass a logical preparation for specific vocations. As illustrations of this I may refer to my own college where courses in chemistry, zoology, forestry, economics, soils and botany are grouped together to form a major sequence for the student interested in wild-life conservation or where sociology, chemistry, physics, psychology, law, military science and some special courses in police science and criminology are taken together to train young men in police administration. Many other such combinations might be pointed out but these will suffice to illustrate a trend.

What I contend is that by offering curricula that appear to lead to definite results—yes, even results that are to be measured by an economic yardstick—we arouse in students an interest that is touched in no other way and we win support of a public that would otherwise be neutral or antagonistic. When these things are done we may present in our training of students all of those things which we feel that they should have along with the core of vocational subjects and the same students who would otherwise rebel at fundamental courses will take them and like them.

It will no doubt be generally agreed that a modicum of mathematics is desirable in any college training. If this extend so far as to include analytical geometry considerable difficulty may arise in maintaining student interest. For many years in discussing the parabola I have used a problem that was presented to me by a road building contractor who had entered suit against the state highway department to recover damages suffered when a set of specifications for a road contract was changed after the finished grade had been prepared. A change in depth of gravel at the edge of the surfaced highway had required more gravel and the hauling in of clay to round off the shoulders. The question of how much additional gravel and how much clay per mile is required will arouse more interest and teach more facts about the parabola than will be learned from all of the stereotyped problems that appear in any text. And why is this true? It is only because it arises in an actual life situation. It is not likely that a single member of the class will ever deal with this problem but

the simple fact that the thing studied is seen to have a definite relation to some one's problem in the business of making a living immediately commends it as something worth knowing.

In equal measure an entire curriculum, with a definite vocational objective, stimulates student interest and leads to concentration of effort ordinarily most difficult to focus. Let a curriculum in hotel administration illustrate two or three advantages of the vocationally directed course of study. The student immediately recognizes the need for study of such subjects as accounting, labor problems, personnel, management, textiles, interior decoration, food preparation and serving, mechanical equipment, insurance and the like. And just as easily he recognizes that to understand these he must study mathematics, physics, chemistry, elementary art, principles of economics and physiology. And it requires no stretch of the imagination to see that French, bacteriology, sociology and psychology will be very useful to anyone in the hotel business.

As a result there is very little opposition on the part of the student to any of the fundamentals of a well rounded college education. What does it matter if the prospective hotel executive turn out to be an automobile salesman or an insurance adjustor? His motivated curriculum has resulted in excellent preparation for either of the unexpected fields of effort.

Turn now to the effect of such a curriculum upon a college faculty. Experience shows that the opportunity to present courses with specific objectives electrifies lethargic faculty members into inordinate activity. This may result in some strain on college budgets to purchase books and pay travel expenses for those who wish to find the best information either through published material or by visits to the best hotels to study the problem at its source. And the increased effectiveness of the teachers will be reflected in all of their teaching. If one is inclined to doubt that such practical curricula are appreciated and expected by those upon whom publicly-controlled colleges depend for their financial support, he may find some convincing evidence of the contrary point of view by considering the cooperative attitude of state boards, departments and commissions in the development of such courses of study and even in instruction in connection with them.

In a rather disconnected way I have tried to present an argument for a liberal training with a practical appeal. I firmly believe that the tax-supported college must keep such an appeal before the taxpayer and the student. Whether such a program is peculiar to the tax-supported school I do not know. I am also convinced that by emphasizing the practical we please our students and our public, we stimulate our faculties to greater efforts, and we need lose none of the values inherent in the traditional cultural curriculum.

"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" may be interpreted, I believe, as glorifying that accomplishment in which definite new goals are attained without any sacrifices of well accepted ideals.

In this direction the publicly supported college is making, and of necessity, will continue to make marked progress.

V. E. CHATELAIN, historian of the National Park Service, reports that hitherto unknown facts have been revealed by CCC excavations at Jamestown, Va., first English settlement in the United States, and that much valuable historical information has been gleaned from battlefields.

It is amazing—the things that have been discovered," he said of the work at Jamestown. "By careful excavation, CCC workers unearth old foundations, measure them and from them may learn much of the early buildings.

These house foundations tell an eloquent story of those ancient days. In addition small Dutch brick imported by the early settlers, chinaware, pottery, iron foot-warmers, and a large collection of bottles and utensils have been uncovered.

On the battlefield at Yorktown, Va., old trench lines have been reconstructed, battery positions have been located and guns have been mounted on platforms and carriages carefully built along the lines of those used in Colonial days.

The CCC also have salvaged the guns, anchors, chains and other equipment of two British frigates sunk in the York River in 1781. These are now on display at Yorktown.

In another phase of its work, officials said, the CCC is restoring and preserving historic shrines. Public parks that encircle the points of interest have been laced with roads and paths.

PROBLEMS OF SELECTIVE ADMISSION

SHELTON PHELPS

PRESIDENT OF WINTHROP COLLEGE

I

CAN PROPER AIMS OF COLLEGE BE ATTAINED WITHOUT SELECTIVE ADMISSION?

THE AIMS of college are the aims of education adapted to the age of students at the college level. To illustrate, one specific aim of elementary education is to teach children to read. This specific aim in college is adapted to the age of college students by teaching them not the beginnings of reading but rather by teaching them proper applications and uses of reading habits already acquired. Similarly, college aims must be adaptation of subject matter in many fields to the changing ages and interests of college students. The ultimate aims of education are the ultimate aims of the college; and while the specific aims of college may be changed by adaptation, these aims must lead to the accepted ultimate objectives of education.

[Here followed an historic review to illustrate the validity of the principle announced in the first sentence of this paper. *Ed.*]

Now it must not be immediately assumed that because for twenty-three hundred years ultimate objectives of education and their adaptations have seemingly revolved around seven rather well accepted principles of education, that there is at the present time or that there has been through those twenty-three hundred years unanimity of thought on this subject. Demiashkevich is, I believe, authority for the statement that the school of thought which does not accept these objectives is not new, but that, on the contrary, it is as old as the line of thought it protests. There is, it is well known, another view of the purposes of education and of their adaptation which gets vigorous voice in any meeting which undertakes to discuss the subject. It would, indeed, be short-sighted to leave out or even to minimize in any way the importance of this second view. Even if it is named second in this discussion, it is only that the logic of chronology is yielded to. There is no attempt to rank the two views as to merit.

This second view would insist that the college take the variable products which come to it at college age and that it adapt its work to furthering the developments of these same variable products. It would further insist that the incidence of emphasis be upon the development of the individual college pupil to the extent that his general aptitude and special aptitudes permit of development, and that this emphasis be not upon the reaching of a certain level of achievement in any ultimate objective. This same philosophy would postulate that all of the characteristics which constitute this high school product be considered in profile and that the program of his future development be in terms of that profile. This school of thought might even insist that passing and failing, as schools have known those terms, are ready for the discard and that development of the individual to the near maximum of his ability is the adaptation of ultimate objective desired and never the accomplishment of a specific level of achievement. It would seem, however, even in terms of this philosophy that the assumption first made can be allowed to stand. Proper aims of college still remain the adaptations of the ultimate purposes of education. Only the point of incidence has changed.

II

IS SELECTIVE ADMISSION PRACTICABLE IN TAX-SUPPORTED COLLEGES?

Again it becomes necessary to define just what is meant by selective entrance requirements. As the term has been used most widely in the past, it seems fair to say that the meaning has been requirements which will exclude from admission applicants for college. It is equally fair to say that selection, as it has been practiced in the past, has had as its main governing purpose the picking out of the people who can most successfully do what have been conventionally considered college subjects. It is not intended to say that entrance requirements have always succeeded in selecting an elite from a mental standpoint. Nevertheless this has been the purpose, to exclude those who could not do successfully what the colleges have taught; and to include the type which could do with a fair degree of success what the college requires. This in the past is what has been meant by the term "selective entrance requirements."

Examination was the first great selective agency. It is still in European countries, in the main, the selective agency. It was frankly designed to produce an educational elite and the first step in the process was to select those who would enter college. In Britain and on the Continent this has been true. Perhaps the greatest educational contribution of this year, and for that matter of many years, was the printed proceedings of the Eastbourne, England, Conference on Examinations. Here, under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation, representatives from the leading nations of the world discussed the philosophy of education which motivated the country of each representative, and discussed examinations from the standpoint of their purpose, their technique and their achievement.

In the United States, determined in part by the asserted fundamental purpose of the country, namely, to bring college education within the range of as many of its population as proved practicable, examinations were gradually replaced by certificates of records of courses taken. Pressure, perhaps, from outside the college administration was the largest single contributing cause. Indirectly stated, the effort, and this is not meant in a particularly critical sense, to bring as many students to the institutions as possible also furthered the use of credentials in their replacement of examinations. In brief, high school graduation with fifteen or sixteen Carnegie units had by the beginning of the present century practically succeeded examinations as entrance requirements.

Two questions of fundamental importance from the standpoint of this discussion seem to come out of this history. The first might be, Is high school graduation a selective entrance requirement? And the second question undoubtedly would be, Is examination a selective entrance requirement?

Before going further with this discussion, it might be well to consider one other phase of selective entrance. Assume that the purpose of such entrance requirement is shifted from an avowed aim to exclude all but one type and to select and include that one type, and that the requirement is put on the quite different basis of discovering both the general aptitude and the special aptitudes of the entrants for the purpose of adapting college requirements and college curricula to those seeking admission.

The question proposed for discussion, as narrowed down, now admits rather readily of answer. On the bases of the exclusion and of the selection of a particular type, it is hard to argue that all of us must pay for the education of a very few of us, particularly if that education is to conform to one type of education. There is an English adage, very old, which says: He who pays the piper calls the tune. Now if all of us pay the piper, are we likely to call a tune for a very few of us and one which may even be displeasing to many of the rest of us? In other words, the question would be answered in this way: in tax-supported institutions it is impracticable to have selective entrance requirements which will pick out only one type of individual and furnish one type of education to that one type of person.

Of course, in the older process of selection described, the assumption has always been made that the intellectually select or the educationally elite were chosen. It seems perfectly natural that the type individual which could do most effectively the abstractions taught in college courses would be considered an educational elite by the people who also could do most readily those abstractions, that is, by school teachers. We were all measured by one measuring pole. Those who did abstract achievements easily were quite tall when measured by the pole. Those who did them with great difficulty or did them not at all were quite short on the same measure. We were assumed to be capable of being measured by the same yard stick and were all comprehended in one commensurable case. It is no more difficult to assume, however, that there are many types of individuals and that the case instead of being a commensurable one only, has also its incommensurable phase. Now in plane geometry it is always more or less difficult to lead students from the commensurable to the incommensurable case. Similarly it is difficult to get people to think of this incommensurable case in education as a phase where various types of people might be equally tall if measured by appropriate measuring sticks, or better said, their abilities cannot be readily compared because they have no common divisor.

Assume, however, that there are several types instead of the one type and that it is equally desirable for the state to educate the several types to somewhat near the maxima of their abilities

to achieve. Now if this second assumption is a "proper aim" of the college, then the process of selective admission might become thoroughly a diagnostic process. Then instead of trying to exclude the prospective student, it becomes a function of education to pick out the several types of individuals among those offering themselves and adapt existing college offerings to those types and abilities. This process admits of an entirely different answer from the other definitions of selective admission requirements. The answer now becomes the statement that such selective admission requirements are not only practicable but that they are indispensable in tax-supported institutions.

To bring this discussion more into the concrete, when a state school receives its offerings of prospective students at any year from the high school, assuming that admission is on a typical American basis of a transcript of credits from an approved high school, these same students would be admitted. Assuming again that some kind of a testing plan should be used for selecting types and special abilities, a process something like the following might be used.

The American Council on Education's General Aptitude Test might be given. Our own psychology professor who is in charge of our personnel work tells me that he has had no serious question of the validity of this test from the standpoint of picking out the people who can do most successfully conventional college work. This seems as far as he is willing to go in regard to this particular test. If the test continues to prove successful to the extent that he thinks it is successful, and there is now a collection of data sufficient to establish the belief stated, collected by institutions using the test, it can well be used to pick out that group of students most apt academically.

This American Council General Aptitude Test, he wants followed by a battery of special aptitudes tests. As we offered the above, the American Council General Aptitude as Exhibit A, we are offering the test recommended by the State Medical College in our state, the "Scholastic Aptitude Test for Medical Schools" as Exhibit B. If this test proves valid in picking out those would-be college students best fitted to go forward into pre-medical work, it could be used as a basis for selecting this type. There are many such special aptitudes tests which could similarly be used in a number of fields of work.

It is not wholly necessary, however, after having accepted the second assumption of this discussion, namely that there are many and varying types of abilities being offered for college, to depend upon a testing program. Such movements as the General College of Minnesota, and a somewhat similar development in the University of Florida, as described in Dean Matherly's article in the November number of the *Journal of Higher Education*, offer two years of work and study as a basis for selecting special aptitudes. There are many who have greater faith in the validity of the two-year program of study by a quota of instructors than they have in any test which has been devised or which will be soon devised. If a plan such as the one implied is followed, one of the "proper aims" of the general college becomes that of selecting the types of individuals as they exist among college students and of offering a basis for adapting college work to these types.

The discussion up to date has avoided a rather serious question from the standpoint of the practicability of this whole matter. Whether the things proposed are practicable or impracticable is understood to mean in this discussion whether the people supporting and controlling the state colleges will consent to them. Heretofore the controlling philosophy in such matters has been *laissez-faire*. The discussion is now taking the trend of substituting direction for this older philosophy. The set-up quite closely resembles the contrast between an authoritarian state and what was formerly defined as democracy. There is no use to shut one's eyes to the fact that collegiate regimentation would not be altogether an inaccurate description of what has been implied and partly described. Just how far the American public is willing to accept and support such a plan of direction can be answered only by a guess. It is my guess that the chief factor in determining how far this matter of selection can be carried is the degree of success, of openness, and of fairness by which it is carried on.

There seems to be neither reason nor basis for believing that willingness to support from public taxation a plan of selective admission, employing examination which would result in something similar to Europe's educational elite, would be accepted as a substitute for the fundamental concept of American public education, which is after all *universality*. Where all willingly pay, all must be able to participate.

It may be well remembered that the present situation in American high school and college education, regarding credits, and the use of transcripts of records for both admission to, and transfer within colleges, is but an adaptation to this fundamental concept. Bluntly put, residence has been substituted in the United States for entrance to college and for the completion of college requirements, in order that more may participate in college. It is not likely that the public will quickly or enthusiastically substitute a plan which will eliminate a very large majority from participation.

Perhaps the strongest argument which can be offered for the second method of selective admission is that the attempted fitting of several types to only one form of education has resulted in a great deal of unhappiness, a very appreciable degree of superficiality in education, and in failing, in brief, to accomplish the purpose of American public education already cited—that of bringing college education to the many. Reasonably successful achievement, as well as residence, is necessary to that accomplishment. The way lies only through adaptation to varying types of abilities.

Out of all this discussion a few things seem reasonably clear. It seems very clear to me that the American concept of public education, and by public education is meant tax-supported, state-controlled education, faces as its most fundamental question the following issue: Which will profit a state the more, that it lift the whole area of its population a little bit or that it lift a much greater bit one point in that whole area. It seems equally clear to me that the answer from the standpoint just named, the state, is that the whole area must be lifted. It seems to me that tax-supported, publicly controlled education cannot or will not follow Europe's selection of and development of an educational elite. This concept has even broken down and is being rapidly modified in those countries which have developed it and which brought it to the point of discussion in the Eastbourne Conference.

This does not mean to say that there is no room in a democracy for schools with selective admission requirements, even on the basis of the former concept as defined. In fact, it is believed that there is not only room but vital need in a democracy for schools of that type. It only says that it is impracticable to reduce the schools supported by all of us to that plan. The honors

courses, which have been transplanted from European to American educational conditions, the whole of the reorganization, as it is represented by such reorganization as the one at Chicago, deserve nothing but commendation; but these, it must be remembered, are in the main being carried on in the so-called independently endowed institutions. Certainly there is a most desirable place, a most distinct need, and a wonderful opportunity in a democracy for this type of school. It just doesn't follow, however, that the tax-supported schools must follow the example of these institutions.

Trying to drive all of these several points into a simplified answer, it would seem that "proper aims" of college are most effectively obtained by selective admission requirements. It would further seem that "proper aims" of college in the immediate sense would be to select the several types among the college student body and to offer to these types appropriately adapted forms of education. And finally, it would seem that the whole trend of the times is toward making this a directed process and not a process dependent upon *laissez-faire*.

As to the second part of the question, Is it practicable to do this thing in tax-supported, publicly controlled institutions? the answer would seem to be that it is practicable if and when the American can be convinced that the method used for selection is a valid one and a reliable one, and further, if and when the adapted method is sanely, carefully and wisely administered. It would be not the least difficult to queer the whole matter by some bungling administration.

Even a profession as close to the public as the profession of medicine, having as high standing with the other professions and with the public as has medicine, must go very slowly in shifting us from some of our long established beliefs. It does not take a prophet to know that the sensational proposal that the medical profession be given the right to take life when in its judgment the taking of life would be an act of mercy, even though there are many people who are quite willing to agree that under certain conditions death is preferable to life, is a long way from practical realization. It does not seem strange then that anything approaching a radical regimentation of human abilities, desires and allocations shall be grudgingly granted to the teaching profession. There are some rights and privileges which must and will remain inherent in the individual.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR WOMEN TODAY

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT*

KATHRYN McHALE

GENERAL DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

THERE are two aspects of the approach to the fitting of the curriculum to the student I shall comment upon.

In developing the educational program for the student the modern college recognizes the principle that it must begin by knowing the needs, interests, and aptitudes of the individual. So we find attempts to discover these as early as possible.

Institutions in a position to guide candidates for admission attempt to develop a plan of study in the secondary school which gears into the college curriculum plan for the first two years. This is true of Smith and Mount Holyoke which it must be understood are not the only women's colleges attempting to do pre-admission guidance. These colleges use in addition to records (Mount Holyoke, Connecticut, Wells, and others cooperate with the experiment of the Educational Records Bureau), the Scholastic Aptitude Test, and other examination results. The student must register to take the College Entrance Board Examinations under A, B, C or D plans, those with high standing in the Regents Examinations may substitute these. Both Smith and Mount Holyoke cooperate with the Progressive Education Association's eight-year experiment with selected graduates from the co-operating secondary schools. After an examination of the admission plans of our better women's colleges, one can say that they pretty much follow this design with but slight variations. All women's colleges want as much information about students before entrance as possible.

In addition to a consideration of the student's needs, interests, and aptitudes at entrance, a small number of colleges as Goucher, Russell Sage, Bennington, and Sarah Lawrence fashion the student's programs in terms of the objectives of the college. Goucher defines eight objectives for which the work chosen in the first two years prepares, the attainment of these is tested as a preliminary to admission to the Upper Division. Russell Sage sets their objectives for a four year period and measures the degree of their realization as a requirement for graduation. These objectives have been selected with a view to their usefulness to women in daily living.

Educational guidance keeps the college's objectives before it and utilizes all the information about the student available. All of the women's colleges make some provision for some degree of

* Stenographic report.

individual guidance. Vassar has modified the course requirements for the freshman year and is providing guidance officers to advise on the selection and coordination of work in succeeding years. Wellesley has a flexible program for the student purposed to give each maximum freedom in working out a program suitable to a reasonable degree of concentration, required work is therefore reduced. Sweet Briar provides faculty advisers and group suggestions for their freshmen and sophomores.

Bennington and Sarah Lawrence are two of the four year colleges that have thrown aside all fixed course requirements and have built a curriculum to fit each individual student. The counsellor is the central feature in these colleges. These colleges believe the advisory system is the crux of education if the institution is thinking of education in terms of the greatest possible development of each student. Each student meets frequently and regularly with her advisers who guide her in the selection of content, who act as a clearing house on her problems, and who help her to correlate the work of different fields.

Women in coeducational colleges enjoy the benefits of a personally adjusted curriculum at the University of Chicago, University of Minnesota, Swarthmore, University of Buffalo, and Rollins. Complete individualization through the measurement of educational attainment is secured at the University of Chicago where through the use of printed syllabi and sample examinations the student proceeds at his own rate in the pursuit of four fields of learning.

Advisory work is an approach that is gaining momentum. According to Ben Wood it is going along without adequate provision for making it effective since it depends entirely upon the wisdom of the people doing it. The attitude of the faculty is the most crucial factor in the guidance problem. It is important that information be adequate, obtained systematically, and wisely used. Since tests are but partial measures, it is necessary, he believes, for subject matter specialists and technicians to derive ways and means of securing more adequate information on personality development, attitudes toward and habits of work, etc.

* * * * *

There is accumulated sufficient evidence to state that the system which recognizes ability and ambition by permitting students to determine their own rate and standard of learning stimulates students to stretch themselves intellectually. Of all changes, the use of honors work to increase initiative in recognition of individual differences is most common. Of the fifty-three privately endowed women's colleges, thirty-four make provision for it, including: Radcliffe, Smith, Pembroke, Mills, Sweet Briar, Vassar, Goucher, Bryn Mawr, Barnard, Wells, Elmira, etc.

Two distinct procedures are to be found. Certain colleges limit admission to the honors course to those who demonstrate superiority in the first two years; this is true of the women's colleges just mentioned. The honors work in some of these institutions is adjusted to each student's ability and initiative and supersedes regular courses; this is true at Smith, Sweet Briar, Mills, Wells, Bryn Mawr, and Mount Holyoke. In others of these institutions it is additional work or an alternate set of requirements as at Wilson, and Rockford. Connecticut College gives the selected student a choice between the two plans. Mount Holyoke, the first of the women's colleges to have established the special honors work for juniors and seniors of ability, now provides a two-unit plan for the freshmen who are intellectually ambitious and sincerely interested in learning; they pursue two courses about which a unified program is built. Some of the other colleges admit all junior and senior students to what they originally designated as honors courses; this is true of the University of Buffalo which began with seniors in the extension of the privilege; they eventually hope to extend the benefits to all through their tutorials.

Independent work or special honors work has developed in the following coeducational institutions among others: Swarthmore, University of Chicago, Carleton, and Oberlin.

The use of the free reading period may be found in seven of the thirty-four colleges for women providing honors courses. Freedom in class attendance is on the whole permitted only upon the discretion of the advisers. The use of the tutorial in some form, and the comprehensive examination technique are fairly general. Tutorials are limited to honors students at Wells, Elmira, Sweet Briar, whereas at Mills and Radcliffe they are for all. The comprehensive examination is given at the end of the senior year in the field of concentration or in the major before graduation for all students in nineteen colleges including Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Vassar, Wellesley, Russell Sage, Wheaton, Mills, Sophie Newcomb, Goucher, while seventeen of the thirty-four women's colleges with honors plans require a comprehensive in the major or field of concentration for honors students including Elmira, Sweet Briar, Bryn Mawr, Pembroke, Connecticut, Randolph Macon, Barnard, and Smith.

Dean Thompson pointed out the special assignment as a means of stimulating the students to stretch their intellects. Mount Holyoke's students in American Government and Politics use the community for the study of its industries and of its public works and the municipal services. Vassar and Sarah Lawrence students of economics have been conducting surveys of communities, housing conditions, milk consumption, and recreational facilities. Bennington's Winter Field and Reading Period offers a unified opportunity for a period of two months when students use the

time in work related to their special interests which can better be followed elsewhere than at Bennington.

* * * * *

I hoped that Miss Cheek might tell you about the recent plan which is being initiated at Mount Holyoke College. Perhaps she will later.

As Miss Glass has indicated, a plant is more than a place for books, teachers and students in a classroom. It is a place for living. Scripps is a plant not only designed for the health, mental and physical, of the college youth but for the gathering of four years of impressions. Architecturally it is Mediterranean and Hispanic in style. It opens from a village street as might any building. Within is a friendly entrance hall, opening by archways into the great court, sunnily inviting, and never closed to the street except by the iron grill. The variety of openings-out to inner courts or loggias which are a part of the living and working space make this an interesting plant. The courts are the real clues to the inner charm of the buildings. The Court of the Fountain with its great Eucalyptus and the Sicilian Court with its stone wellhead from Sicily where it adorned the walls of some olden nobleman, whose arms still decorate its sculptured sides are not infrequently used for class work. The Christmas season has been the occasion of plays and pageants in the Court of the Palms. The Nativity is represented each year in all the color and beauty which this setting with its mosaic Star of Bethlehem floor, well, palms and shrubs, provide.

Women's colleges as Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Wellesley, Vassar and Smith from the time of their founding in the second half of the nineteenth century have been organized on a distinctly residential basis. They claimed for the education of women the beauty of setting and the amenities of living which at the time were but little considered as having cultural influence. Gracious living important in social education not only characterizes these colleges but Sweet Briar, Wells, and Connecticut. Men's colleges in this country throughout the same period paid little attention to students outside the classroom, even now very few offer more than shelter. The great majority of dormitories have not been conceived as social educational agencies; they are separated from the curriculum and the active intellectual life of the colleges.

The residential colleges at Oxford and Cambridge developed residential life as highly significant educational media. They have long used their housing units to bring deans and students together not only for formal individual conferences upon their academic work but for social and intellectual intercourse. President Comstock of Radcliffe recently called attention to Virginia Woolf's contrast in the standards of comfort and quality designed for the social education of British men and women, indicating that though

American women were not yet dining on "sole, partridges, and wine" they do have the amenities of living and the beauty of setting denied many British college women and American college men.

According to Cowley there are three major housing philosophies, all of which have their adherents in the American colleges; first, the British point of view; second, the German; and third, the American compromise, giving some or all shelter, but which conceives the residence apart from the curricular life of the campus. Cowley calls attention to the women's colleges in this country approximating the British men's residential college, the University of Nebraska and the University of California, the German, and the rank and file of coeducational and men's colleges adhering to the third.

DISCUSSION

PROFESSOR MARY V. HEINLEIN (Sarah Lawrence College): We devote a large part of the time at the beginning of the year to allowing the student, if possible, to start the self-direction or the self-motivization in picking her own curriculum. I would like to describe the exact mechanism of this. There are three guides, not one, from three different fields; art, the science field, and perhaps the field of literature. The student meets in conference with those people at various times and talks as much as possible about her interests and her intentions.

She is sent, not just to those three people, but to various members of the entire faculty. The student comes to the college, in fact, without any understanding at all of what the curriculum means, or any part of it. But by devoting two weeks to a procedure in which she discusses herself and her problems with perhaps seventy members of the faculty in various conferences, we find if she once starts in any direction there will be very few changes in the curriculum she adopts.

This is the first year we have tried this, and it is the first year we have an almost entirely satisfied student body in so far as choice of subjects and the seeming worth of those subjects to the student is concerned.

* * * * *

CHAIRMAN GLASS: Miss Cheek, can't you give us in a word what Mount Holyoke is trying to do in what it is half-way through putting into effect:

DEAN CHEEK: In the seven houses we are trying to put into effect a plan in which we are having members of the faculty as house deans; that is, they are non-resident persons who come into the house two or three times a week, always for dinner once a week, and usually for the house tea and ordinarily one other time a week for a house function of some kind.

Associated with the member of the faculty who is the house dean is a group of other faculty members, chosen from different fields of interest, who are proposed by the house dean for appointment to the house by the president of the college. This group comes in from time to time and is welcome at any time. The students come to feel that they are honorary members, so to speak, of the house, and they are particularly identified with their interests. The resident person in the house we are calling a resident fellow—a young person who has been out of college from two to five or six years, usually. It is not the age of that person that we are particular about, but the type of person. We have tried to get a person of distinctly superior intellectual achievement to that of the students themselves, who would definitely get hold of their imagination in this way as well as appeal to them socially.

I think the work in the house gets to be a little routine, and we cannot hope to hold indefinitely a person of superior ability. These persons were picked very, very carefully, both for the girls and in the interest of guiding the student, and they are usually persons who are going into the work in the administrative lines in various instances.

CHAIRMAN GLASS: Is it part of the scheme that students living in the house should continue to live in the same house as long as they wish, or do you encourage them to move?

DEAN CHEEK: No, they move each year; it happens to be an old tradition with us. I have been interested in having them remain, but I can get no enthusiasm on the part of the students. They are a most conservative group.

* * * * *

DR. McHALE: Art offerings have broadened in the women's colleges. Historical and technical courses are numerous and varied in treatment, studio work has become an important inclusion.

Smith has offerings for the undergraduate, for the major, special honors units, and offers graduate work. Their interdepartmental majors are receiving special preparation for professional schools in "Dramatic Arts" and "Architecture," and "Landscape Architecture." This is only one of the women's colleges that gives prominence to the arts as a liberal educational offering.

About one-fifth of all students are in art courses at Vassar, this includes studio as well as the history courses. Two experimental features of the art offerings at Vassar seem unique. The Co-operative Bookshop in cooperation with the Art Department makes available to each student who cares to rent them, four selected pictures for one dollar each, one each quarter. The Experimental Theatre at Vassar has become widely known for its experimental work with production and modern methods of stage crafts and acting, its paramount interest is in the premières of student plays.

Mount Holyoke, through its Foundation of the Friends of Art, has enriched opportunities in the community for the appreciation of art. Like Vassar their "Playshop Laboratory" has vitalized the work of majors in dramatics in the Department of English Literature. In addition to the history of drama and related work these majors have the privilege of guidance under those who have had proved experience on the stage and in production, including designing, painting, building, artificing properties, lighting, etc.

Barnard and Sweet Briar have developed abilities to do difficult choral music. The performance of old Italian Madrigals and cantatas along with Howard Hanson's *Lament to Beowulf* and Brahms *Requiem* were achievements credited to Barnard last year. Barnard does significant work in the dance, too. Introduced in 1908 in the Greek Games, it has flourished as a medium for physical development, esthetic pleasure, and creative achievement.

Bennington and Sarah Lawrence give prominence to creative art. Ample time is allowed the student to explore her talents and to develop appreciation. Sarah Lawrence uses New York City to give students artistic, musical, and dramatic advantages. Students there are required to report on eight hours of leisure, this may be used in the studios, with musical instruments, chorus, workshop, field work, etc. Bennington's students like Mills' have a chance to show their abilities in connection with developments of the campus, residences, etc.

Bryn Mawr has recently determined to appraise art from the technical as well as from the theoretical side. They plan not only to offer the field of American Archaeology in addition to Classical Archaeology, but to give all such majors practical training. *The Bacchae* of Euripides was one of the productions of last year which gave those concerned with "Greek drapery" an opportunity to recommend the classics, with the help of those concerned with diction, choral, music and dance work.

Goucher has an unusual arrangement with the Walters Art Gallery of Baltimore. The Director being a member of the faculty, the sixty million dollar collection of the Walters Gallery offers an unusual laboratory for the students. The collection covers the period from earliest Egypt to the end of the nineteenth century.

Mills' Art Department had ten exhibitions last year, one of these was the first exhibition in Oriental Art ever held on the Pacific Coast. The exhibit consisted of five hundred objects ranging in time from the Neolithic Age to the nineteenth century.

FITTING THE CURRICULUM TO THE STUDENT*

DAVID ALLAN ROBERTSON

PRESIDENT OF GOUCHER COLLEGE

IN THE Association of American Colleges, I think people will know what I am talking about if I refer to a catechism. I want, in fact, to mention two: the catechism of the Chairman because she is an Episcopalian, and that of the first speaker because he is a Presbyterian. President Glass' catechism has as its first question, "What is your name?" And that of the Westminster Church catechism is, "What is the chief end of man?" Therein, in those two first questions, we have the principal subjects of the first topic we have to consider this afternoon, the one leading directly to the personnel procedure which we have developed, and the second to objectives.

The American college, generally, both for men and for women, may be said to effect a synthesis between these two simultaneously, and not successively. When King George crosses the border into Scotland he becomes a Presbyterian; when he returns to London he becomes an Episcopalian. In colleges for both men and women, we establish that synthesis simultaneously.

The subject of the session is "Trends in Higher Education for Women." How many instances must there be before we establish a trend? I am told that not long ago a young man in Harlem desired to join a lodge and had a friend propose him for membership. After three or four weeks he asked this friend whether he had been elected, and the friend rather grimly said "No." The Negro said to his proposer, "You don't mean that somebody gave me a black-ball, do you?" The proposer said, "Rastus, did you ever see Russian caviar?"

To establish a trend it is unnecessary to make our spot diagram look like Russian caviar, but we must not exaggerate a single instance.

To enumerate all of the things which institutions are doing, time does not permit. In Dr. Kathryn McHale's article in the December *Journal of Higher Education* you will find a very good report of what is going on in connection with trends in the higher education for women.

* Stenographic report.

The very first sentence uttered in this meeting established the tone characteristic of a group like this. President Glass removed all limitations. We are not talking about colleges for women in New England; we are talking about all colleges for women in America. We are not limited to early colleges like Elmira and Wesleyan. When we study education for women, we are not limited to the United States, we go into England to look at Newnham, Girtor or the London County Council Training Colleges. Moreover, in our desire to learn the best, we do not limit ourselves to colleges for women, as President Glass has pointed out, but consider colleges for men, and not only those on the Association of American Colleges' program of yesterday afternoon, but every men's college where there is something worth while going on. How few references there were yesterday afternoon to Harvard, to Yale and to Princeton, which are doing some rather interesting things at the present time! Again, we are not limited only to colleges for men, but study colleges for men and women—Chicago, Stanford, Minnesota—and not only colleges but professional schools, primary schools, secondary schools and elementary schools. Even the pre-school experience is most important, as the records of the AAU show clearly, because we have come to realize that grades of students in freshman composition are conditioned by pre-school influence of the natural mother of the child. We are not limiting ourselves in our search for ideas for the curriculum and other phases of education. That is one of the first trends to mention before discussing the specific problem which concerns us, the fitting of the curriculum to the student.

Curriculum seems to require a definition. It used to be in terms of required semester hours, required credits, required courses, and in terms of administrative mechanism only. As I shall use the term this afternoon, the curriculum is not just a device for the convenient imparting of departmental information, but a device for the education of a woman, and as trends show in several institutions, we might almost say in many institutions, the trend is to make the curriculum include, as does our program this afternoon, all influences affecting the education of a woman, while she is in what we call a college: the development of the library as an educational device, not merely a reservoir of books; the influences which arise from residence—influences which affect health, influ-

ences which affect English, influences which affect human relations.

To turn to a subject which I mentioned at the outset, objectives. Dr. Morgan talked about the *trivium* and the *quadrivium* and he himself suggested a group of five. It interested me that in setting up those five objectives, he chose five of those we in Goucher College have set up for ourselves, as the aims of what the President of our Association seemed to disapprove as a term, "general education." If you make reading and writing the mother tongue an objective, as Dr. Morgan did, you want people to read and write. In the women's colleges, notably in Goucher and Smith, we are testing the ability of the student to comprehend and communicate ideas in English by the modern device of watching eye movements. By establishing a kind of clinic, we are able to help not only low grade people, but, as we have found in our experiments, high grade people who can be made even more effective through aid of the psychological counsellor.

If you have read Carl Brigham's report on the selection of candidates for fellowships of the Social Science Research Council, you know that at the level of the first year of graduate work, as in the first college year, there is a shocking display of ignorance with respect to ordinary mathematics. We are offering individual work in the kind of mathematics necessary in chemistry, or biology, or in the keeping of a budget. It is voluntary work entirely. It is all outside of what in most places would be the regular curriculum, because we are not bothered with credits. We are after the objective and not the accumulation of semester hours or other forms of machinery we used to talk about. Dr. Morgan mentioned science, physical and biological. His fourth point was human development, the organization of society, manners. The fifth was "desirable," not essential, introduction of students to the culture of another people beside one's own through the medium of a foreign language.

Now let me run through our Goucher College objectives for you very briefly. The first is the establishment and maintenance of physical and mental health. Characteristically, as a representative of a British tradition, Dr. Morgan did not mention that. The English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish universities do not place the emphasis on health that our institutions, notably the colleges for women, place on it.

Next is the comprehension and communication of ideas in the mother tongue and one foreign language.

Third, the understanding of the scientific method in theory and application.

Fourth, the understanding of the heritage of the past in its relation to the present.

Fifth, establishment of satisfying relations with individuals and with groups; the art of human relations—an art furthered by residence.

Sixth, the utilization of resources with economic and esthetic satisfaction. We include the use of time, money and strength, and not only economic satisfactions but esthetic satisfactions resulting therefrom.

Seventh, the enjoyment of literature and the other fine arts.

Eighth, something Dr. Morgan omitted, philosophical and religious values.

Courses in a curriculum are merely a convenience, economic and administrative, in helping the student attain certain of these objectives. It does not much matter, if the student has the point of view and understands the objectives, how the curriculum itself is organized. I know of one student in Wellesley who, within the somewhat more restricted curriculum there, is carrying out the Goucher College program with respect to these objectives. It is entirely possible that it can be done, even where the restrictions are much greater than at Wellesley. But in order to get these objectives, the student must generally have a larger freedom to choose. That freedom is coming to the women's colleges very much more rapidly than it is to the men's institutions.

I am not forgetful of what happened at Harvard in the elective system under Eliot. But that failed because there was not enough guidance for the student. Therefore, we are putting into our institutions guidance based on an understanding of the student's own self. We are making available for a guidance officer, a tutor, an adviser, whose duty it is to understand the student, all the information about the student. The use of tests is intended to enable us to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the student with regard to training, with regard to interests, with regard to abilities. Some of us are using what was frowned upon last night, a psychiatrist—an ugly word—but a very valu-

able thing. Through psychiatrists and other officers, we are getting records by which we are able to help an officer to understand the individual and to guide the student properly. We are accumulating in our institutions this evidence which we need, by means of the sophomore examination and the comprehensive examination.

You see I am just registering topics, rather than going into detail about these things. Doubtless questions will come up afterwards, and we can ask each other questions about how each does a particular thing. At any rate, we are not interested, I think, in more mechanisms. We desire to get rid of excessive machinery and to gear what is useful in what is already developed in our educational process, by maintaining our point of view; interest in the individual and all the personnel devices we have to help us understand the individual; and objectives.

By going straight to the objectives I think we are not making the mistake in the women's colleges of losing ourselves in semester hours, in required courses, and in other examples of machinery that I could give you, or in "engineering enterprises" such as were mentioned last night. We are, rather, realizing that we are embarked upon a spiritual undertaking, and that if we have a teacher, a great teacher if possible, the machinery will not greatly matter if we keep it from getting in the way of the teacher, and also of the student. Because after all—and this is the most important thing we are emphasizing in the women's colleges today—and its importance is shown in all of the memoirs written by people important enough to write their memoirs—the thing we want to get is the self-starting of the student. We work for that golden moment when a Wilson takes his education into his own hands, or an Edmund Burke, or a Bismarck. It is that instant when the student becomes responsible for her own education that we are striving for, teacher and student, allowing nothing to interfere in splendid opportunity for cooperation of both, not even a curriculum in the old sense.

EFFORTS TOWARD ENCOURAGING INDEPENDENCE AND INITIATIVE IN STUDENTS

C. MILDRED THOMPSON

DEAN OF VASSAR COLLEGE

AMONG the trends in education in the last ten or fifteen years there has been apparent in programs of associations such as this, more and more emphasis on teaching and learning, that is, on the chief business of the college instead of on its incidents and accidents. The main tent is the center of interest and side-shows no longer overshadow it. Colleges are no longer afraid to put emphasis on the intellectual life, and more than that, they are not afraid to admit this emphasis. With frank recognition of the development of intellectual power as the chief business of a college, it is apparent that the encouragement of independence of thinking and mental initiative on the part of the student is the chief way by which the intellectual life becomes active and fruitful. This brings me to the very heart of the subject assigned to me.

As we would expect, new machinery and educational devices have been able to further this new interest. The content of the curriculum has not been the focus of activity in this latest interest. Long since the emphasis on the curriculum has ceased to be placed on two or three prescribed subjects which were regarded as essential to the education of a civilized person and necessary in their disciplines to clarity of thinking or to accuracy of observation. That battle has been fought in time past—and I use the figure advisedly, for truly it was a battle with its field of combat and its all too hostile forces on one side and the other. The battle of the classics furnishes no longer the campaign field of educational forces. It serves rather as a field of memories and of monuments, of hopes lost and won. But already it is mostly overgrown with a new crop of problems to be harvested.

Our present concern is far more with the method than with the matter of the curriculum. What, then, are some of these methods of the collegiate process, all pointing in varying degrees toward greater independence for the student?

Most widely heralded of the newer methods is the honors plan, a plan new in our education, but, like most new ideas, essentially ancient, taken over in large measure from the ancient tradition of Oxford. I am not sure just how far the honors plan may work in the direction of encouraging independence and initiative in the student. Independence? Yes. Undoubtedly the commonest adaptation of the Oxford Honors Plan to the American college has meant greater independence in work, more complete self-reliance of the student in efforts in learning, and in correlating his material in different fields. The close tutorial system usually associated with the honors plan works generally, I think, towards training the student in independent work habits. It may seem paradoxical, but like most paradoxes, it is the expression of an essential truth, that the tutorial method of instruction or the small class method begets greater independence on the part of the student. This freedom of judgment in the student and greater responsibility on his part seem to grow in direct relation to the closeness and intimacy of instruction.

Closely associated with the honors plan and the tutorial system is the comprehensive examination. But this may represent the reverse of the picture. The primary value of the comprehensive type of examination is, it appears to me, not to develop initiative or independence in the student, but to encourage other values: that is, greater thoroughness and depth and sense of relationship among many subjects rather than fragmentariness. Unless it is counteracted or accompanied by continuous emphasis on independent methods of work and by other plans to develop initiative and the expression of individual interests, the comprehensive examination may work for a new authoritarianism and a tight formalism at the apex of the course. I hope that we teachers and administrators may be wise enough to head off this danger of rigidity, and to keep the comprehensive examination as an aid to thoroughness and to a student's sense of mastery, and at the same time not to cramp his opportunity for independent growth.

A corollary to the comprehensive examination is the lessening of emphasis on courses and the accumulation of units. I confess I am not one of the continuous critics of all American education on the ground that our system for the most part states a quantitative demand for the degree. Some standard, some measure is

essential. The damage is not that we use terms of units or points or hours, but only if we value the sign instead of the thing signified. If the emphasis in actual teaching and learning begins and ends with units or points or credits, then we are intellectually indefensible. But there is a possibility that some of these newer mechanisms which express revolt from courses and hours may in time themselves become stereotyped. We all here are too experienced to be fooled by terms or symbols. In evaluating educational aids we are well aware that the capital "P" or the little "p" is an insufficient standard by which we may determine what is or is not progressive; and we know that some of the finest work in the encouragement of independence in students may be carried on in courses, even courses credited with so many points or hours. Labels old or labels new are not enough for our basis of discrimination among values.

Unfortunately I was not present yesterday at the section which discussed "More Recent College Plans" but from what I know of the plans presented, all are concerned fundamentally with the encouragement of independence and self-direction in students. I shall not try to repeat, therefore, what undoubtedly has been said by those who know these various plans at first hand. I shall only mention two or three methods which have been operating in my own college in the direction of the aims announced in the subject given to me.

Our chief asset at Vassar College is in the small class as the dominant teaching unit. We have limited our numbers by strictly selective admission over a long period of time, and hence have been able to control the size of classes. The average number of students to teacher is slightly more than eight. This enables us to do a great deal of individual teaching, through conferences which are supplementary to class, and through individual programs of work in library and in laboratory. A library on the "open shelf" system is the chief instrument of independent work in literary or historical subjects. "The special topic" is no new feature of our methodology. Developed many years ago under Professor Salmon of our History Department, its use has spread until practically every department employs it as a means to develop independent interests and workmanship. Students are encouraged to select their own subjects for investigation within the

field of the course, or to relate two or three fields of study. The amount of supervision and direction varies, but on the whole the topics represent a large amount of self-direction. For several years, a few of these "special topics" have been gathered together and printed in our *Journal of Undergraduate Studies*. These papers do not pretend to be pieces of original research which present new knowledge, but they do represent in large measure the methods of independent study and examination by which the research of scholars is carried on.

The "New Curriculum" which the faculty adopted last year incorporated two features which together foster more self-propulsion by students. A four-course system was substituted for the five-course plan as the normal program; and with the reduction of courses there was also a reduction in class hours, to be effective progressively from freshman to senior year. In the last year, many advanced classes met only once a week for a two-hour session. This gives to students much more time for their own study outside of class direction, and places upon them larger responsibility for their results. The freeing of larger segments of time is proving significant, especially in the courses which demand reflection upon material. We were late in adopting the comprehensive examination, but this now common device is incorporated in our curriculum, together with tutorial guidance in the senior year. This plan is so generally in use that I shall not dwell upon it.

All of these plans and methods of study are devised unmistakably for the encouragement of greater independence and for the growth of more vigorous initiative on the part of students. The question now ahead of us is, What are we in the colleges and we in society going to do with and do about this independent, self-reliant spirit we have fostered? Are we going to face the consequences fearlessly and to fight to keep open the paths of intellectual freedom for our students and for ourselves? This is another study, and would make a suitable subject for discussion on our next year's program. In the meantime, I would say *Bravo!* to the words of the President of our Association (President Wriston) which I heard last evening over the radio. May his wisdom and his courage prevail!

UTILIZATION OF DAILY LIFE AS A DISTINCT PART OF EDUCATIONAL PROCEDURE*

MARY ASHBY CHEEK

DEAN OF RESIDENCE, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

I AM to discuss, I believe, the utilization of the non-academic life of our colleges in the educational scheme. Whether it is from a sense of emulation or competition, whether it is because of the demands of the outside world or the natural development of organizations within the colleges, or whether it may be the outgrowth of certain educational ideas, certain it is that the extra-curricular life of the women's colleges has within the last few years attained an added dignity, and the residential life in general has, I think, taken on added importance as a part of the educational scheme of things.

It is a long cry from the day when the wearer of a Phi Beta Kappa key was all too infrequently interested in matters outside the curriculum, and when students engaged in extra-curricular activities were frequently carrying more offices than any one human being could be expected to handle efficiently. I agree with Dean Thompson in thinking that it is a great day when students are not ashamed to be intellectual, and certainly that is true in our colleges today. It is also important that there should be a healthy balance between the two sides of the college life. Likewise, in the housing systems in our colleges, there was frequently a dearth of the stimulating intellectual and social life which one might have expected to find. Compare with that the situation today, which I think is a much healthier one. We find, to begin with, that correlation is very high between the students who are holding the important offices in non-curricular activities and those who are doing fine academic work. It is the thing to be intellectual. One is not ashamed of the fact. One looks for leadership in those students doing fine academic work. Also, we have definite curbs upon the activities of those largely interested in outside activities. There are census systems or other bits of machinery, by whatever name they may be called, which definitely limit the number of activities in which any one student may engage.

* Stenographic report.

Also, one finds that instead of *dormitories*—I underline the word—which were oftentimes presided over by conscientious matrons, interested mostly in the physical set-up of a house, the food and the housekeeping arrangements, instead of these one finds today, and in many institutions for a good many years past, attractive houses under college women of definite intellectual interests and of fine social and cultural background. They are interested in creating an atmosphere in which one will find not only a delightful social experience, but also the opportunity to develop intellectual interests, thus taking over into the common life much of the interest which one has developed in the classroom under members of the faculty, or from touch with others who are stimulating that interest in intellectual things.

It is very interesting that students themselves have dignified extra-curricular activities largely through the fact that they themselves are very much more mature today than they were a few years ago. I don't mean they are older, but more mature in their outlook. They very definitely object to being called "collegiate." They wish to be women of the world in their interests and in their actions.

As a result they cultivated a certain external sophistication which was not altogether pleasing, but since the very sobering days of the depression, the ambition to be a woman of the world has taken on a much more sensible aspect. One finds that interest in outdoor things is increasing, since the depression has diminished the number of long and expensive week-ends. One also sees the growth of interest in those things which can be carried over into life in the outside world after college. For instance, it is riding, skiing and other individual sports, rather than the group sports, which seem to be gripping the interest and imagination of students.

There is a tendency towards intercollegiate connections in extra-curricular activity which I think certain quarters are viewing with some alarm. It seems as though no week-end can pass without collaboration with one's neighbors in a neighboring woman's or man's college on some common project. It is probable, however, that in small colleges, particularly, there is a very real perspective that is given in comparing the ideas of students on one campus with those of their fellow students on a neighboring

campus. There is a stimulus that comes which is of distinct value, if these meetings are not held too frequently and do not involve too large a number of students.

Also, in the women's colleges, we find it is valuable to have the intellectual give and take that comes in meetings of this kind between the men and women. The women's colleges are far from being the nunneries that sometimes they are said to be. One is impressed with the ease with which girls and men take their collaboration together, the interest that they have in discussing questions of collegiate interest and of national and international concern. Here again is another distinct aspect of the extra-curricular activity these days—the national and the international interests of students, which I know are to be touched upon later, and so I will not go further into this interesting development at the moment.

I should like to mention briefly the importance, as it seems to me, of departmental clubs in the non-academic life of the colleges today. There has been in many colleges a renaissance of the departmental club. It used to be a very formal affair and the students felt they must attend meetings because members of the faculty were expecting them to come. There was too much of the old classroom attitude carried over in what should have been an informal give and take between members of the faculty and students.

One finds most delightful changes in gatherings of this kind. Students are given the opportunity to talk with persons of greater experience in their field of interest in informal surroundings, possibly around the fireplace over the coffee cups.

Then, as to the influence of the community life, and that in the houses in particular, on students, we are realizing that not only in the person of the one who heads up a house, but in the organization of the life of the houses themselves, we have the machinery for intellectual development. There is a chance here, if properly planned, for students who are not interested in the same field of interest, as is the case in the department clubs, but who are intellectually minded (or those not so intellectually minded as well), to meet and discuss under the very simple system of gathering by the fireside to talk over questions raised in academic

courses and the affairs of the outside world, as well as their own personal affairs.

It is very interesting to see how delighted members of the faculty are to go into groups of this kind, and not only to get acquainted with these mixed groups of students socially, but to have an informal intellectual give and take with students whom they might have no occasion to meet in the classroom. In other words, it is the larger areas of intellectual interest which one may develop outside the classroom, together with the way in which stimulating contacts in the houses may be used as a bridge between the intellectual and social life of the student, which constitute the educational value of the new housing schemes.

**STRESS ON THE RELATION BETWEEN COLLEGE
ACTIVITIES AND CITIZENSHIP IN THE OUTSIDE
WORLD, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL, IN
HIGHER EDUCATION FOR WOMEN**

HENRY W. LAWRENCE

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE,
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE

WE ARE told that modern youth, especially college trained young men and women, are the hope of the world. I wish to suggest that they are likely to prove no better than a very forlorn hope, unless they pay more attention to preparing for the business of citizenship than they have commonly done heretofore.

The youth of today need to be reminded that the poor showing made by us of the older generation in managing national and world affairs is not due wholly to the fact that we did not try hard enough. It is partly due to the enormous difficulty of the task with which we struggled. If the youngsters are to succeed where we oldsters failed, it is high time they began to show more zeal and competence for their approaching responsibilities. Unless they heed the urgent calls of the time for better citizenship and more enlightened patriotism, there is not the slightest probability that they will manage any better than we did.

In urging and aiding college undergraduates to make more intelligent efforts toward competence for active citizenship, we

are not asking that they disregard the older ideal of self realization. We are, rather, pointing out that no better opportunity confronts them today for finding themselves and for developing their personalities, than that offered by public service.

A few months ago, we held, at Connecticut College, a conference on the education of women for public affairs. This conference originated in a glimpse of opportunity and a consciousness of failure. The opportunity was the suddenly expanding list of tasks to be performed in the public service, national, state, and local. The failure was the comparative disinclination and incompetence of most college graduates to perform these tasks.

The opportunity and the failure confronted all the colleges. Connecticut College called some of them into a conference, to pool their ideas on meeting the emergency. A manageably small number (fifteen) of neighboring colleges for women were invited, and their eager response seemed to show that the effort was timely. The original promoters of this conference believed that it should include a leaven of representatives and ideas from outside the academic circle. Hence many persons active and prominent in public affairs were asked to contribute written suggestions, and a smaller number were invited to attend and participate in the discussions. A ninety-page booklet, entitled "Better Citizenship," was published to record the discussions and conclusions of this gathering, and this booklet is now available to anyone interested.

The growing interest in the citizenship aspect of college education is attested by the fact that we are here today, under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges, to consider, as one of the "Trends in the Higher Education of Women," the "Stress on the Relation between College Activities and Citizenship in the Outside World, National and International." In the discussion which is to follow these introductory remarks, we may be able to pool the experience and clarify the ideas of the colleges here represented. To initiate such a discussion, I am venturing to mention a few of the things we are attempting at Connecticut College toward persuading and assisting our undergraduates to make the college letters, "C. C." stand also for "competent citizenship."

These attempts, with us, take the form of a supplement to, rather than a replacement of, the more theoretical courses in

political science. We have only two instructors in the field of government. One of these offers the type of course which might be called the "regular"—possibly the "old-fashioned" kind; stressing, in its presentation of facts, thoroughness and order rather more than realistic and stimulating contacts with the outside world of politics and government. The other instructor, a person of long and varied experience in dealing with the problems of actual government and politics, serves us as a sort of liaison officer, linking into an ever growing unity the ivory towers which dot our academic groves, and those busy marts of political corruption and governmental inefficiency which constitute what the topic of this conference calls "the Outside World, National and International."

Evidently it is the procedures of this latter instructor, this liaison officer of ours, that are most likely to offer suggestions of interest here today. They deal chiefly with state and local government, and they have a threefold objective: (1) To teach the student how to find out the significant facts about her own community; (2) To make her acquainted with the chief obstacles to good government; (3) To put her in touch with the forces by which these obstacles may be surmounted. The procedures employed to achieve this objective include: (1) The use of state legislatures and local government agencies as laboratories, for observation frequently and active participation occasionally. (2) A frequent tie-up of student interest and activity with pressure groups and political parties. (3) Student attendance at conferences which seek to promote one phase or another of civic betterment. (4) Actual participation by some students in survey work of a professional character, and by many students in realistic surveys of their own communities or other civic areas. (5) The use of town reports, surveys, etc., in place of conventional textbooks, the latter being employed only after the first-hand materials have been explored. (6) An effort to find for each student, especially at the time of her graduation, a competent political adviser resident in her home community, to steer her away from avoidable frustrations in her efforts to be a good citizen.

This is a large order, representing, thus far, as much of aspiration as of achievement, with us. Doubtless other institutions have done very much better.

COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN THE ARTS—REPORT OF SECTION "A"

FREDERICK C. FERRY

PRESIDENT OF HAMILTON COLLEGE

WE who were permitted to hear the program on art yesterday afternoon listened to those who were entitled to speak with authority. And what shall one say of that session who, as a stranger, looked on from afar? He can say that some at least of his hopeful suspicions were turned into beliefs, and that he brought much enthusiasm from that gathering, for the speakers persuaded us to believe that the arts are not taught,—nor to be taught,—in the colleges for the developing of skill, but for the purpose of giving understanding; and that they are to fit into the background of history and of all else that is cultural in the college and to contribute greatly there.

In particular, when the singer sings a beautiful song, he should know not only the name of the composer and the name of the poet who wrote the verses, but should also have an understanding of the setting of both of them. In what kind of days did they live? Who were their friends and contemporaries? What were the conditions of their countries that persuaded them to write as they did?

Similarly, the undergraduate should not only be able to tell of the painting itself, the name of the painter, the title of the painting, the period of his career which it represents and perhaps the year of its painting, but what kind of man the painter was. How did he fit into the history of his day? And what in that history forced him to paint as he did?

Those are things that are essential in the teaching of art; but, of course, beyond all else, the teaching of art should lead one to enjoy the beauty of it. And until all the beauties are revealed, the teaching cannot be counted well done.

So these arts in the colleges that have come there to stay are not to prepare for careers, but are to interpret the life of the past and to enrich the life of the present and future for the undergraduate.

One who contributed to the discussion at that conference quoted somebody to the effect that art does not "exist." We came away with the feeling that, if art is only a matter of dreams, we must encourage the dreams, for in them there is beauty; pleasure is their guerdon, and delight is their apparel. Our undergraduates in these days, when we all of us feel so much of stress and strain,—and these undergraduates are bound to live in that kind of setting for at any rate many years,—have need of that sort of thing. So let us give it to them, and, in giving it, be sure that we are contributing something entirely appropriate to a college of high integrity in the field of liberal arts.

Above campus activities, curriculum and content, above intellectual power itself, is the spirit of culture, the integrated view, the understanding mind that sees in deep perspective and in wide relation. There is no magic in the liberal arts course to make the liberal mind. A student may master the words and syntax of a language and miss the majesty and beauty of the literature. He may learn historical fact and miss the influence of the moral heroism of Socrates, or a Wilson, or the spiritual beauty of St. Francis or a Florence Nightingale. He may discover or dig out facts and have no sense of humility or opportunity in the presence of the implications of the discovery of truth for mankind. The teacher's opportunity comes in the opportunity to help the student develop not only mental discipline, mastery of content and intellectual excellence, but also an attitude of mind, an intelligent response to heroic situations, and an appreciative assimilation into the core of his own character of the nobility in the lives of those whom he meets in books and life. The liberal education would give both depth and breadth to the mind and would embrace in its deepening processes of integration the spiritual values of human personality.—*Frank P. Graham.*

THE GENERAL PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE GIVING OF COLLEGIATE INSTRUCTION IN ART*

FRANCIS HENRY TAYLOR

THE WORCESTER ART MUSEUM

IN A brilliant address given before the American Association of Museums in which he showed the necessity for adequately trained curators, men whose research stood the test of academic discipline, Professor C. R. Morey, of Princeton, declared that "the history of art is now recognized as no longer a mere embroidery on the other humanities of history and literature, but a humanistic discipline of independent value, by reason of its power to coordinate and integrate the other humanistic pursuits of the undergraduate."

He has, I think, defined for us the mission of the fine arts in our present-day education. For, after all, the fine arts represent not merely the residue of culture and of a certain type of critical learning, but more particularly they form a residue of human enjoyment. What has been preserved has been preserved because of a sensitiveness and love of beauty that is, despite all the clowning that takes place among the *cognoscenti*, inherent in the human race.

I come before you today, therefore, not as a college professor or as an educator in the accepted academic sense, but as the custodian of a collection of works of art, products of imaginative thought and vision, which have been preserved and, moreover, enjoyed, (that is a very important point—enjoyment—but I mean by enjoyment something that transcends pleasurable enjoyment) and which must, therefore, have a meaning, a meaning to be understood.

We have divided up the purposes and avenues of education into such narrow channels that I hesitate to draw from my particular experience analogies between your problems as college educators and my own. But there has been too long a separation between formal and informal education. In the fine arts there has come about, happily enough, thanks to an enlightened group of persons (of whom Paul Sachs and his colleagues at Harvard,

* Stenographic report.

to name but one example, are the spokesmen) a reciprocal invasion between the art museum and the university. But still our fundamental spheres of influence are so far apart that many persons accept this divergence as an alibi which excuses us from informing ourselves about the other fellow's problem. The classic example of this attitude, I think, is found in the story of the comfortable middle aged teacher in the school of education, who, working in graduate English, was called upon by the professor to explain what a verbal noun was, and she couldn't do it. Her reply was, "I don't have to know; I teach backward children."

I think that is the state of mind which has gone into art teaching, that we don't have to know. It has come about as the result of specialization. It is the penalty we have to pay for too great specialization in current education. And with this specialization and this feeling that we don't have to know somebody else's business has come about the disappearance of the "cultivated gentleman."

Now perhaps you will think that I am a complete barbarian if I say I am interested, as a museum director and as a museum educator, in cultivation much more than I am interested in education. There is a very strong difference, and I think the function of the fine arts as an introduction to the humanities is to clearly establish that difference between cultivation and education *per se*.

I believe that the art museums, furthermore, at the present time are the first outposts and at the same time the last bulwarks of the classical learning to which we owe our entire civilization. We are not merely the custodians of so many paintings and so many pieces of old statuary; we are the custodians of standards; standards that proclaim and maintain themselves in a thoroughly irreligious and mechanized world. I often think that the only moral justification for a public institution in spending, let us say, \$100,000 for a single masterpiece in a community in which one out of every four is on public relief, is that that institution is contributing not merely to the wealth of that community, the artistic wealth, whatever that may be, (for nobody seems to know), but it is building up little by little the spiritual standards and defenses of that community, standards and defenses which its citizens will have to depend upon more and more in the future.

I want to stress again the tragedy of the disappearance of the cultivated gentleman. Prior to the Civil War, it was possible for the college graduate to become pretty well informed in the humanities and in science. Specialization had not gone so far that a person of good intelligence and taste might not be conversant with the major trends and discoveries of his time, which he might place against a humanistic perspective. But today education is a very different matter. How much longer will you ladies and gentlemen, presidents of American colleges, be able to hold out for compulsory Latin and Greek in your curricula and for the discipline of mathematics? Aren't you every day compelled to make some fresh concession to the fields of science, engineering, political economy? We live for the present, and we fool ourselves that we are educating ourselves for the present. What do your students know of history and of that great by-product of history, biography? They want to cram themselves full of facts which may be obsolete five years after graduation in the belief that this will teach them to manipulate people. Yet they never stop to study the lives of men and women who have changed the course of history. It may be prejudice on my part, but I am convinced that a careful reading of Plutarch, of Machiavelli and of Benvenuto Cellini, is a better preparation for a career on the Stock Exchange than either an introductory course in credit and banking in a business school, or a sophomore course in psychology.

What substitute then can we have for the learning of our grandfathers which will give us something of their taste and flavor, their general cultivation, yet at the same time permit our students to profit from the factual benefits of a modern education? I believe that the answer lies in the fine arts. To repeat Mr. Morey's words, the fine arts must be the humanistic discipline of independent value that will coordinate and integrate the other humanistic pursuits of the undergraduate.

I want to take a few moments to discuss certain of the general aspects of the opportunities offered by the fine arts for humanistic revival, not only in the colleges but in our schools as well as in our recreational work with adults.

Now it seems to me that the one advantage of the history of art is that it is history as "she is wrote," because the pamph-

leteer, the journalist, is always a generation ahead of his time, and the historian is always in perspective a generation after the event, and the artist, who we have been led to suppose has been a naive creature, has claimed that he has made a record of his own time as his own eyes have been able to interpret the event.

Now for that reason the history of art can be perfectly well taught as a complement to the general humanities and not as an abstract and theoretical application of esthetics. That is where we have made the great mistake in so much of our art teaching. I have no right to be talking here. We in Worcester have this museum which is in the center of a great many colleges, and I see only the students from these colleges as they come in as casual visitors. I see the art major students of all the New England colleges who all think they are going to get jobs in museums when they graduate. I had 315 applications from New England colleges alone for jobs last June so my perspective is not the perspective of one who teaches them but of one who sits in the office and tells them, "We are awfully sorry, we shall be delighted to keep your names on file." Therefore, I have a definite perspective and a certain sympathy with them from the point of view of not only what they are being taught, but a deeper sympathy for the things they are not getting out of their college education.

Now, again, I think the most important thing is presenting art as a complement to the history of culture. Three years ago, Mr. Keppel asked us if we would take on a job in the New England boarding schools. The job was to try to make a dent in the football-minded students of our boarding schools in regard to the fine arts. The reason for it was, he said, that the great difficulty during the depression with art departments and art institutions of all kinds was the fact that the trustees had not been educated up to their responsibilities and he said, "Where are the trustees of tomorrow? Here, probably, in the New England boarding schools today, whether you like to think so or not. See what you can do."

So he gave us a very handsome grant, and we started in working. We spent a whole year surveying the field before we moved at all, and we ended up by making a series of some twenty exhibitions of visual material in the fine arts, and that visual material

we didn't build at all in the way of courses. We built it around the reading requirements of the College Entrance Board. The exhibits are not a thing of passing or gossamer value to the schools and are not looked upon as just another gadget or as an aspirin contribution to educational progress. There has always been a subconscious desire, on the part of the schools, for something tangible in the way of art contact, something of cultural value that would not be too detached from their curriculum. The alacrity with which the schools are receiving the exhibitions reveals that their dormant interest in esthetic values is becoming more overt and that the exhibitions are supplying a positive need. Because these exhibits are based on the average curriculum of the secondary school, the need for them will run parallel to the cycle of freshmen replacing seniors. There will always be the yearly crop of new students who will not have seen or studied the exhibitions in connection with their regular studies.

The circulating exhibitions are based directly upon the required reading lists for college entrance credit, complementing the work of the classroom and attempting to give a cultural background for the humanitarian subjects studied in the secondary school. There are exhibitions devoted to various phases of American history, others to Homer and the Age of Pericles. Rome in the time of Vergil and Caesar is also well represented with authentic material rarely included in textbooks, and an important series of exhibitions has been prepared describing the secular and ecclesiastical traditions of Europe in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Literary associations have been particularly stressed in the exhibition of English life in the time of Shakespeare and of the Eighteenth Century Elegants. The Grand Siècle exhibitions illustrate the France of Racine and Molière; the dramatic occurrences of the French Revolution are also shown by unusual and distinctive plates. There are also exhibitions on the civilizations of the Orient.

Only the finest color prints and photographs available have been assembled for this purpose at considerable expense. Each exhibition is accompanied by comprehensive explanatory matter; a selected bibliography for the teacher and lantern slides relative to the subject are furnished upon request. All these exhibitions are circulated free, the exhibitors paying only the express charges for shipment to the next point of exhibition.

The exhibitions include: Art and Life in Ancient Egypt; The Homeric Poems; Greece in the Time of Pericles; Vergil and the Aeneid; Bible Illustrations from the Earliest Times to the Renaissance; Chivalry and Courtly Life in the Middle Ages; Medieval Life of the People; Medieval Minor Arts; The Bayeux Tapestry; Shakespeare and Tudor England; Le Grand Siècle; The French Revolution; American Art of the Colonies and the Early Republic; A Series of Exhibitions on the Oriental Field.

Those exhibitions which we have been circulating free of charge in the New England schools were designed not to be a special thing in themselves but to complement the ordinary work of instruction in those schools. They were designed to fit the specifications necessary for college entrance, and they were accompanied by bibliographies not for the students but for the teachers, with the call numbers of the books, slides and photographs in the public libraries of Boston, Providence, Worcester and New Haven and the other big libraries of New England.

In addition to that, there was a complementary group of slides which went out with those exhibitions so that any master could teach his students, whether he was teaching Latin or whether he was teaching Greek or history or English or French. He could do the instructing as he saw fit and use the material that we prepared for him as an illustration of the thing he was doing, and we didn't go around giving any series of peripatetic lectures or preaching the gospel of art for art's sake.

Now I mention this work in the secondary schools because I think there is a great analogy that can be carried out in the colleges. I don't believe in the introductory survey courses, in the omnibus course in the history of art. It is, I realize, often necessary to give such courses from the point of view of economy and administrative routine. But don't fool yourselves into thinking that your job in regard to the fine arts is over. I think such courses purely superficial; they are not tied up with the other work. I think they are an unrewarding expense to the institution. It means expensive equipment. I think that the whole value of the appreciation of art course, your introductory course, can be obtained by a higher level of instructors in your other humanities groups. If you have better instructors in history, better instructors of philosophy, better instructors of languages

and the classics, people with a wider reading, a wider interpretation of life, they can teach art tutorially by way of illustration, after the formal lectures by the professors; you don't have to increase the quality or number of your professors; but increase the quality of your instructors and let your students take this art material as a perfectly normal understanding of the subject which they are studying and then, after they have done that, they are ready to take special courses in the fine arts themselves. Then your student who has come to recognize fine works of art as the products of a time which he has studied from the point of view of language, philosophy or history is ready to get at the very "guts" of the subject. He will have the time to analyze the artistic significance of a painting or statue. But I think that the general omnibus course where you start in October with prehistoric Egypt and come out with Picasso on the 30th of May; God help you; it won't do any real good at all. It is just a smattering of art jargon that doesn't get anywhere.

I want to say one word or two about the specialized course and what I think is the great failure and misfortune of the highly specialized art department in the small college. I think that there has been a great deal of strutting among smaller colleges in the boots of the university. Thank God for the difference that exists between the college and the university. The college can play the game of general cultivation that the university no longer can. I believe that this fact has been recognized at Yale and Harvard by breaking up the university into a series of colleges in the English manner. Why not be satisfied with giving your undergraduate the background of general knowledge that will make his later specialized work more human and less mechanical and grim? Specialized teaching and specialized courses are very often beyond the undergraduate and again they take up a great deal of money, they require more instructors, more professors, more library equipment, which, again, I feel should be distributed through the whole fabric of your institutions so as to make art a much more normal and less specialized part of your curriculum. It is very much more important to teach your students the place of a man in his time than it is to have them know the differences between his early and late periods.

I think it is a little absurd that we find, particularly in New England colleges, so many of these young men and young women come out and they can tell you down to six months to what period of Titian, El Greco, Velasquez or Rembrandt a particular picture belongs; they can tell you not only the date of it, but the numerous variants that exist; they can tell you its dimensions, what drawings exist in various places of it. Yet they are not any of them able to tell you who Maximilian, Charles V, or Philip II were or whether there was any relation between Spain and the Low Countries during the period in which these people were painting.

We have put the cart before the horse so completely in this whole field it is essential to place artists and their works in the period of history to which they belong so that they are part of our culture, of this general accretion of the humanities, which we all share and which we all ought to inherit.

Then I want to make two more points before I stop, particularly about observation and enjoyment. A work of art is created to be enjoyed and understood. It was never created to be published with the possible exception of the print or lithograph. Works of art were created by the artist generally because he couldn't help doing it. I think that something has to be done to increase the training in observation and in vision and enjoyment, because the professors of art in our colleges have to regard works of art simply as subjects for Ph.D. theses. This is as ironical as it is ridiculous for these works of art which are published to death are often really very great objects in themselves. They can only be understood by looking at them, observing them. And from my own experience (I started out in medicine, and the period in which I had to work in the laboratory over the corpse dissecting out the nervous system and the circulatory system was the most valuable training I ever had), I know how important observation is. I was taught to look at what I was doing, and it taught me to observe condition. And again I say these fine connoisseurs of photographs that come out of the art departments and the graduate schools, particularly in the East, have no conception of condition, they have no conception of touch or the feel of the object itself. Now, how in the world can a piece of sculpture lack the sense of touch? It is a definitely tactile object. It never would have been created if it didn't have touch.

That brings me down to the final point that works of art are pretty well distributed through this country now. There has been an extraordinary growth of museums and private collections, and I think one of the extraordinary American characteristics is the generosity of the private collector towards students. I think it is very rarely that you find a private collector who will not open his or her collection to the examination of students. I beseech you, make the best of the opportunities lying at your door so that with all the work, all the courses that you can give, you may impose upon your students a little bit of self-communion before a great work of art. This will teach them a great deal more about looking than they can learn about art through their ears.

I suggest these few things as antidotes. I think that if we get art on a more general, on a more sensitive basis and something that is part of the general fabric of undergraduate education, that the accusation of Duns Scotus leveled against the schoolmen in the twelfth century at the University of Paris, "They were so concerned with the humanities, they forgot humanity," is something we may escape.

ROBERTA M. FANSLER

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART, NEW YORK

I THOUGHT it might be interesting to go over briefly at the start the five general types of art departments which we now have on the campuses. If I leave some out, I humbly beg your pardon, but I think this covers in a summary fashion the types now in existence.

In the first place, there is the department which is devoted to art history primarily with no practice in art, no training in theory and practice at all. Those are often very highly developed, very highly specialized; in a great many of them you have the omnibus course, the survey course.

The second type is similar, only that it has as a kind of laboratory work, courses in the practice of art which in the best departments are closely coordinated with the courses in art history and criticism.

The third type was referred to very recently by a college president as a "basket weaving establishment," the department which teaches the crafts, which is, in effect, a small art school on the campus and offers perhaps a two-hour course for two semesters in history and appreciation of art. These three are all among the older types of art departments.

Among the more modern and more youthful departments there are two which have in common an emphasis on the creative expression of the student. They might be said to have as their aim the therapeutic value of art in the life of the student. In one type, the college has brought to its campus the practicing artist, has set him up with his studio on the campus; and the college hopes, perhaps too sanguinely, that the very presence of the artist on the campus is going to encourage the students to drop in out of curiosity, to remain to pray, to work, to model and to paint. In some cases this has been tried very successfully, and where the artist in question is of an energetic and proselytizing type, you will find that he eventually gives courses in art history, lectures which at first are open only to the select few who have gone to his studio, and later to the student body at large. Those departments are not very old, and at present I know of only three. However, there are probably others.

The second type of progressive art department practices on a rather grander scale. It starts out with a whole staff of artists instead of the lone man in his studio. This staff has a plan, it has a whole set of theories, and the various instructors do a great deal of talking. In my experience, they talk a great deal about the individual student, about his "creative activity," and his "psyche," and all the rest. It is very esoteric language and I don't pretend to understand it. The emphasis there is distinctly individualistic. The practice of the arts in this type of department is supplemented with excursions among works of art of previous periods and races, but the focus is all upon the here and now. In one such department, I heard an instructor remark that he had wanted to give a course in the culture of the Italian Renaissance, "*But*, unfortunately, such a course, where the material was reached through the visual arts primarily, involved considerable reading, and our students don't like to read, so I had to give it up." One would suppose that this would be a distinct handicap in teaching art.

These, then, are, roughly, the five types which we have on our campuses at present. In order to come to some conclusion as to "how important" the work done by these departments is, one must have some idea of the ends toward which they are working. The aims as they are written into the college catalogues are almost as diverse as the catalogues themselves.

It may be interesting to go back to some of the original credos on which the earlier departments were founded. There is an early account of the art teaching at Vassar in the 1860's, which describes Professor Van Ingen's lectures on the theory and history of art, and then goes on to say that "in the late spring, Professor Van Ingen would take some of his pupils to sightly spots overlooking the Hudson. They would carry their luncheon in baskets and spend the day sketching under his supervision." This would seem to be an early example of the combined study of history with training in the practice of the arts.

On the other hand, Charles Eliot Norton at Harvard in the seventies, and later, depended on the spoken word as a key to understanding. In one of his letters to Carlyle, he speaks of his ambition "to lead his students to the Acropolis, to make their Greek histories and tragedies come alive, to compare and contrast the two republics, Venice and Athens." Here is the first example of that emphasis on art as illustration of human history which we are finding increasingly today and which I think has already been suggested to us as an end. In that type you have art taught as one of the humanities.

Still another art department, that of Cornell, announced in 1892, that the object of its department of classical archaeology was to place the student in the position to do independent investigation. That is certainly the end of some of the departments which are trying desperately and successfully to put the study of art on an intellectually sound basis, to get away from the old tradition that it is a snap course, to give it some standing academically. There is a great deal to be said for this point of view, I think.

Here at Cornell there was no more thought of the possibility of including practical art courses than there was at the University of Michigan where it was held that "universities should only teach the fine arts in their scientific principles, not in their details.

The fine arts are a branch of esthetics and only as such can be a subject of scholastic lectures. Their manual operations are only to be taught in the art academies and in the studios of artists."

That was in 1875. In 1935, as I have pointed out, both the studio and the academy have arrived on the college campus and are doing business there with, or without, benefit of academic credit.

From this very hasty backward glance, let us come down to the present-day aims of instruction in the arts. We state them somewhat differently today, but I think, in general, we cover very much the same ground if you combine the various aims of these earlier departments. We want, or should want, I believe, to train the critical judgment of the undergraduate. (It is still called teaching appreciation, though I wish it weren't). And we still want with Norton to make their Greek tragedies come alive, through the visual arts to coordinate history, to reach an understanding of human activity. The former aim, that of training a critical public to whom art is not a veneer of culture but a part of life, should be the first and directly immediate object of all art teaching in colleges, I believe.

If in the course of training critics we also give to a young artist the fundamental training necessary to his profession, all well and good; but the object of an undergraduate art department in a college of liberal arts should not be professional training but education in art as a means to an understanding of history, of culture, of man himself. To understand the language of expression of which the visual arts make use, it is valuable to know the spelling and grammar, just as one's ability to write English helps one to understand Milton. On the other hand, to enjoy Shakespeare, one does not have to write blank verse of distinction.

However, you see the subject is being divided here between an exponent of art history and one of the training and practice of the arts. I think it is perhaps unfortunate that the field should be so carefully divided, not today but in general. In reality, the closer the cooperation between the instructors of drawing and painting and those of history and criticism, the better. If indeed the rare individual can be found who can teach both, dovetailing the one with the other, explaining one in terms of the other, then the department should be complete. Too often the people who

are trained in the history of art, who understand and can teach art philosophically, are not competent to teach its practice.

A tendency among progressive colleges is to insist on manning the department of art with artists only, whose training has been anything but adequate in the history and the philosophy of art. They are not sufficiently familiar with the neighboring fields of history and literature to teach art as the humanities should be taught.

How, then, should art history be taught? We will use the second type of art department as a basis for our curriculum planning, a department in which both art history and practical art are taught, with the closest possible coordination between the two.

In the first place, an introductory course will be offered which is given either by the rare artist historian of whom we have spoken rather enviously, or by the best art history teacher in the department; the very topnotch one, not the instructor, but the person who is seasoned and knows how to teach. He would do it with the help of the instructor in drawing and painting. It will not be a survey history of art covering ancient, medieval Renaissance, modern architecture, sculpture, painting and the minor arts. There are such courses. It may be a course in the art of the Italian Renaissance, a three-hour course with two hours required adjunct in drawing and painting. In the first course the student takes, he should find that the acquisition of facts is not sufficient, that the ability to see relations between facts, to understand them is essential. This course should be primarily in the critical understanding of art, and as such it will embrace the study of form character, of iconography, of the social significance of the arts, of their place in Florentine society in the year 1400, let us say, the relation of the artist to society, to the church, to the state, the nobility, the merchants, the workers; the extent to which the sciences, literature and the drama affected the arts, the extent to which, in turn, the pictorial arts influenced the drama, and so on. That is rather repetitious but it should be, I believe.

It seems a rather large order, but it is no more than I was offered in a course in Nineteenth Century English Critics in college.

The student must learn in his first course to use his eyes, to understand the creative problem of the artist. That, I think,

is very much more important than most teachers of art realize. He must learn to know quality of style when he sees it, through familiarity, not through being told this is good and that is not. And he must get at least an inkling of the part that the arts play in the history of his own kind. In this connection, I should like to quote from an article written by Professor Morey, of Princeton, on graduate work in the fine arts. He says that the "teacher will be effective to the degree to which he can impart to his students a perspective of the past. His value to the present lies in his ability to interrogate the past and bring its experience to bear upon contemporary problems."

I think this is essential. It is this type of teaching which is wanted in undergraduate courses in the history of art. It is this that both the progressive types of art department which I have mentioned are apt to lack.

Mr. Morey says further, "The humanistic teacher must have explored his own territory so expansively that the boundaries thereof have disappeared and the contours of the neighboring areas of knowledge have acquired a familiar aspect." This is what I should like the student to be offered in his introductory course.

When he has taken such an introduction to the subject, the student will have a tool, a means of understanding with which he can then proceed to work the field in so far as undergraduate time permits or his interest dictates. I doubt if it matters what part of the field the department is equipped to cover after this introductory course is given. This will always be conditioned by the personnel and size of the department. I don't think that an undergraduate department should attempt to give a complete view of the entire history of art because of the danger of stressing facts rather than ideas.

Also, such preparation as is necessary to pass a general examination for honors seems to me to lay far too much stress on the examination as an end at the cost of the philosophic values. I should leave the highly specialized work in fine arts to graduate study where it constitutes definite preparation, either for teaching or for research. Undergraduate training in art should not be vocational. I have had some experience in the past three years in trying to find jobs for prospective job holders, for new gradu-

ates trained, highly trained, in these specialized departments. There are no jobs for newly graduated majors in art. Whether the graduate departments to which these majors go for further study want the highly specialized preparation or the more general preparation which I suggest, I am not competent to say.

On the other hand, it was my experience when for a while I was working at the Carnegie Corporation going over the applications for fellowships for graduate study in the arts, that the graduate departments, Harvard and Princeton, for instance, and New York University, found the students coming from such a department as I have described thoroughly able to fill in the gaps in factual knowledge with a maximum of efficiency and of understanding.

There is another aspect of art instruction for colleges which I would like to bring up before I close. It is fairly unexplored territory, but I think we ought at least to look at it. I rather believe that art as one of the humanities, as a social study, should not be confined to a single department, that the colleges would do well to curb their enthusiasm for building bigger and better art departments which sooner or later out of pride and overabundant energy tend to go in for honors and for altogether too much graduate character. On the contrary, if the colleges would insist that some of this energy should be deflected into channels of cooperation with other departments, much might be done toward making the arts a significant part of a liberal education. I should like to see a college make the experiment of having one member of its art department give no regular courses. This person could alternate with his colleagues; he needn't be the same one every year. He would be to the rest of the college, to the other departments, more or less what the museum instructor is to neighboring colleges, one who would make available through exhibits of photographs, of originals when they were to be had, and through slide lectures the body of illustrative material at the command of the college. Perhaps I can illustrate that very briefly.

A history professor dealing with the break-up of the Roman Empire and the beginnings of monasticism would do very well to call upon the itinerant member of the art department to give a lecture on the art of the early Christian period. The two pro-

fessors would confer thoroughly beforehand so that the art lecture would really fit into the history course. One could multiply such examples. Suppose a literature professor is dealing with Rossetti and Swinburne, it is almost essential that he give some attention to the pre-Raphaelite painters. If the lecture can be supplemented either with slides or with an exhibition of photographs arranged by our itinerant member of the art department, again, the necessity of pointing out contacts and relations would be obviated. The relations would be self-evident and very much more forceful, I believe.

With the breaking down of departmental barriers should go such extracurricular activities in the field of art as the picture rental collections for students which have been tried out with great success, notably at Lawrence College, at Amherst and at Brown University.

A lending library of prints and color facsimiles having no direct contact with any course, entirely extracurricular, which is based primarily, as all art is based, on enjoyment, should really be an essential part of art education; to make it, as Mr. Taylor has suggested, a part of the life of the student rather than simply a department in itself.

To sum up, the fine arts should be taught as a complement to the humanities; the aim should be to create an "understanding heart." I use that phrase advisedly because, it seems to me, while it has no scientific psychological connotation—it means nothing to a psychologist—it includes the very important aspect of the arts, the training in feeling which is essentially a part of art as it should be taught in the colleges.

ARTHUR POPE

DEPARTMENT OF FINE ARTS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I SHOULD like to emphasize first of all the artificial character of the distinction between the history and the theory and practice. You cannot have history of art in any significant sense without some sort of critical discrimination, and you can hardly have any consideration of the theory of art without some consideration of the history of art. The two things go together.

I shall speak on theory as applied to the fine arts because I think that to the ordinary person theory in connection with the fine arts doesn't mean very much. Theory in music is a generally recognized affair and it is understood that any one studying music,—trying to understand it,—must know something of musical theory, of harmony, of counterpoint, of musical forms, and so on. Theory on the side of visual art is, I think, not so clearly understood. So I shall try to state very briefly my idea of what theory in the visual arts means, and on account of the limitation of time I shall confine myself in this to drawing and painting. I think by means of a statement of what theory means in connection with drawing and painting, one may understand what theory means in connection with all of the visual arts.

Now one aim in the teaching of the theory in connection with drawing and painting is merely to give an understanding of drawing and painting as a means of expression. In this way it is about like rhetoric in connection with the teaching of a language. There are a great many dialects used at various times and various places in drawing and painting, and in order to understand what has been expressed in these various dialects, one has to understand them as one would understand a language. To the ordinary layman who has had no training at all in the fine arts, a Chinese painting or an Indian painting is often rather an incomprehensible affair. It is necessary to understand the painter's language, to understand his point of view,—of course also to understand something of his environment and background and the technical process and technical method that he employs—but understanding of the language is fundamental. So in the theory of art from this point of view we take up the variations in what we ordinarily call modes of representation or modes of drawing and painting.

Brought up in the tradition of the nineteenth century, we are apt to conceive painting as a matter of sitting down in front of an object or a scene and painting something on a canvas which looks like it; but there is a great deal of painting—indeed some of the finest painting in the world—that has no superficial resemblance to the object at all. So we must consider the principles underlying the different modes or manners of expression. We may consider the Chinese mode, for instance, the way in which it is used, the various conceptions that are employed in that par-

ticular phase of the language of drawing and painting. We may take up the Egyptian and Greek modes and the difference between the linear point of view in one type of painting and the plastic point of view in another. We can then understand the hybrid modes, such as those we find used in Byzantine and Romanesque painting and, as a matter of fact, in a good deal of modern painting, where we have a combination of a plastic tradition with a new linear point of view derived oftentimes from influence of the art of other epochs.

Briefly, that is one principal aim in the teaching of the general theory of drawing and painting. It involves, of course, an understanding of the general principles of expression in line: for instance, how three-dimensional form may be expressed in line—the various devices which may be used for this purpose. It involves consideration of the use of line motives in the rendering of details; it involves also expressionistic use of line—the use of particular types of line for the suggestion of emotional content in harmony with the general subject matter. I cite only these few instances; things that are taken up in connection with the use of line. It also involves an understanding of the theory of color or what I should call tone relations, that is, an understanding of the attributes, or the perfectly simple three dimensions of color—also the principles involved in tone relations in nature and in tone relations in painting.

Another aim in the teaching of the theory of the fine arts is to give an understanding of the fundamental principles of design. If we take painting, for instance, we have the possibilities of the simple arrangement of tones on the flat surface of the canvas. We have also the possibility of three dimensional arrangement, and in addition the possibility of arrangement in the realm of ideas, and we have the possible organized relationship of all these to each other and to the medium and handling. The teaching of theory involves the understanding of the principles of design as applied to the terms of drawing and painting—as a basis for pictorial design, for instance. It involves also the understanding of pictorial forms, because we have forms in painting somewhat analogous to forms in music. As a matter of fact, the fundamental principles of design, or principles of organization which are universal in all the arts, are particularly easy to understand

in connection with the terms of vision, because we can get down to simpler factors in connection with the terms of drawing and painting than in connection with the terms of language or the terms of music, even. We have the simple spatial factors of positions, measures and shapes, and the tonal factors of value and hue and intensity.

All expression in drawing and painting is by means of these terms. Expression in all the visual arts is fundamentally by means of those terms. It is possible in connection with these visual terms to understand the working of the general principles of organization in simple illustrations and simple examples.

Now when it comes to the methods of the teaching of the theory and practice of drawing and painting, of course the theory is largely a matter of lectures and reading like the history; but for complete understanding a certain amount of practice is almost essential. But practice from this point of view is something quite different from vocational practice.

I think that almost everything that Mr. Randall Thompson has written in connection with music could be put right over into the discussion of the teaching of art, especially from this point of view. On account of the lack of anything better, there has been a tendency for colleges when they have decided they want to teach the practice of art merely to engage the services of professional artists. The courses which they give are something like courses in art schools. Sometimes colleges have taken over whole art schools and established them like conservatories of music in the college, or in connection with the college. That, of course, puts the same emphasis on the mere vocational side at the expense of the general understanding that the establishment of the conservatory or conservatory courses in music do in the case of music. What I should mean by practice would be a practice which would assist in the understanding of the fundamental principles of design, of the different modes of representation—practice which would assist in giving an insight into the qualities of the works of art themselves.

In connection with the general theory of color, for instance, one would have to make a certain number of scales of the different factors involved in color. In connection with the general principles of drawing, one would have to make a certain number of

drawings—exercises—which would indicate the possibilities of expression in different manners in drawing. One would make drawings which would assist in giving insight into the fundamental qualities, the fundamental organization of lines in good drawing. These drawings don't need to be elaborate professional affairs. They may be very much the sort of thing that we have in courses in English. In courses in English we ask students to try writing a bit of poetry or a bit of argumentation or a bit of description; oftentimes it is a matter of a short theme, oftentimes it is a matter of a paragraph. We can, even in a college course, get students to write or compose in the language of drawing and painting paragraphs or sentences, maintaining really high standards in what they do, but not attempting to have them turn out professional paintings or complete works of art. The aim in this case is the development of understanding and entirely away from the development of mere skill. Of course, in the process students acquire a certain amount of skill but the emphasis is not on the training in drawing and painting as skill, but on the training in understanding.

I believe that we may have the same teaching of theory in connection with the other arts. I think we might have the same thing in connection with the teaching of architecture and other structural arts. Bosworth and Jones in a survey of architectural schools have pointed out that the architect has not been able to present his case to the layman, even as clearly as the painter does; that the layman has very little real understanding of the fundamental character of architectural design—that is, of the relation of the fundamentals of the relation of form, structure, materials and function. I think it would be possible to develop the teaching of the theory of architecture, not for the architect but for the layman or for the layman student, with the idea of increasing his discrimination and really training him in some sort of discrimination in connection with architecture and the structural arts.

As I said, very frequently when the college tries to have some sort of actual practice in the arts, it gets some professional painter to carry on the work on the practical side. It becomes vocational. There is one principal reason for that, namely, that there is at the present time practically no place where we train students for this particular kind of teaching. I think that this

is one of the great needs at the present time—a production of teachers who are able to carry on instruction not merely on the historical side but on the side of theory and practice in what I should say was a rational or sensible way for the college. This training on the side of theory and practice is not meant as professional or vocational training. I think such vocational training has no place in the college. Nevertheless, this kind of training may possibly afford the best possible introduction for the professional painting. And I believe it would be possible on the basis of a sound instruction in the general principles and in the general history of the fine arts to prepare students to go on with actual professional training, possibly in graduate schools or in special professional schools, in a much better way than they are trained at the present time where the whole tendency is to take them and isolate them from a fairly early age and have them do nothing except merely practice their art.

I think the speakers this afternoon are fairly well in agreement as to the general aims and also I think as to the necessity of co-ordinating the work, not only fine arts courses between themselves but fine arts courses with the courses in the humanities in general.

I think the emphasis I should like to make on the teaching of the theory and practice is that it fits into that general understanding of the fine arts as a whole, as an essential part of our whole life.

DISCUSSION

DEAN R. M. OGDEN (Cornell University): If I may take a moment I would like to report a plan of study in the fine arts at the undergraduate level which we have recently inaugurated in the College of Arts and Sciences at Cornell University. The plan is of "an omnibus" character, the idea being that undergraduate students would like an opportunity to acquaint themselves, not merely with one of the fine arts, but with all of them. This particular program, therefore, includes a rather wide range of electives; but the student is required to take a certain amount of work in each of the three fields of literature, of music, and of the visual arts. An attempt is made to correlate these fields by courses in esthetics; first, a general course, two terms in both the psychology and philosophical aspects of the subject, followed by some informal work of an advanced nature for senior students before graduation.

In addition to this partly practical, partly theoretical, work in each of the three fields, a student must select one of these fields for a bit of advanced work, the amount being equivalent to at least twelve hours. Altogether the program requires a minimum of forty-eight hours on the usual semester basis, but the important thing is that in the selection of courses the student is at least exposed to the main principles of history and theory in music, in literature, and in at least one of the visual arts, architecture, or painting and sculpture. Among the variety of courses that may be taken in the visual arts there is a special prescribed course in the appreciation of architecture which deals with some of the principles of which Mr. Pope has spoken. Appropriate courses are elective according to the needs of the student in a rather wide range of literature, whether it be in English or in a foreign language, the options also include dramatics, theoretical and practical. In the case of music the minimum requirement is ten hours in the history and theory of that subject.

I mention this program because it has long seemed to me that one of the limitations on college instruction in the fine arts, was that of specialization, such as has been referred to by the speakers this afternoon. I have often found persons in my own courses in esthetics who before this study were unable to understand what music might be about, or why people cared very much for pictures, and I dare say there are also intelligent persons who think they don't know what poetry means. I am not sure that any very large number of students will ever be interested in such an impractical program of study as is here outlined, but it seems to me that if the conditions of our curricula provided opportunities for studying these various fields of art simultaneously, more students might be encouraged to improve their esthetic sensibility without the requirements of specialization, which in no case can be effective without a corresponding talent for writing, drawing, or musical performance.

* * * * *

MR. W. M. IVINS (Metropolitan Museum, New York City): May I break in, sir? I have listened with the greatest of interest to the three speakers and to the address that you read, sir. I found myself wondering whether a great deal of the trouble in the teaching of art, and in the theories about the teaching of art, is not to be sought in the fact that nobody as yet has ever been able to define art. It is very difficult to teach and to argue and discuss a matter which you can't define.

About thirty-odd years ago Professor William James wrote an essay which, according to Professor Whitehead, was the biggest shot that was ever made by any American philosopher. As

I remember, it was entitled "Does Consciousness Exist?" and it came to the conclusion that it didn't. (Laughter.)

I want to ask you all, does art, just plain "art" exist? Personally, I don't believe it does. We are born and we go through a certain amount of life, and we die. We have a certain amount of experience in that life and we give forth a certain amount of expression to our reactions to that life. And that is all.

Now, so far as justification for the teaching of the history of art is concerned: There was a fellow who is known in English history as the Trimmer, the Marquess of Halifax, who wrote a little volume of political apothems which comes closer to containing the wisdom and pithiness of La Rochefoucauld than any other book in English. One of his smart-cracks, as we call them in our vernacular today, was this: "The best qualification of a prophet is a good memory." The principal reason we should teach art history is that it provides us with the good memory of what happened in the past which we need to be able to deal with the present and perhaps to have a little bit of a guess about what is going to happen tomorrow.

Then, there is another reason for the teaching of art history. If I remember correctly, Mr. Santayana, another gentleman who has a certain renown, once said something like this: "The man who does not know what his predecessors have thought is apt to set an undue value upon his own ideas."

After a final quotation from still another man I am going to stop, having merely posed this question to you,—“Does art exist?” For until you have answered that, all your teaching about it doesn't mean anything. Until you have made up your minds on that and until you have gone to the mat with Kant and Berkeley and Schopenhauer and the rest of them, all that you say is merely a way of passing time pleasantly or acrimoniously, according to your temperaments, but it gets you not one bit further for anything in life.

My quotation is a phrase that was used constantly throughout his teaching by one of the great art teachers in Vienna, the man who did more than anybody else to put the Kunsthistorisches Seminar in Vienna on the map. He had a horrible unpronounceable name and I won't try to say it, but his idea was this,—it kept running all the way through his lectures all the time: "We must constantly regard art history as the history of the human soul." His phrases for it, his shorthand for it, was *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, and until in our colleges we begin to teach *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*—!!!

* * * * *

PRESIDENT AURELIA H. REINHARDT (Mills College): I would like to pose a question and make a statement.

I am one of the grateful auditors who would be glad to carry away some of the conflicting as well as some of the harmonizing statements. I do ask this group if it isn't true that what we often tend to emphasize, to discuss and sometimes to quarrel about as, shall we say, the practice in the arts—if it isn't a fundamental to either acquiring knowledge of the history or developing the discrimination to appreciate, to value, to know. There is in expression an exercise of the human mind and spirit that it seems to me is fundamental to the understanding of any art whether it is that Mr. Randall Thompson has studied to the benefit of all of us, or the art that the last speakers have discussed.

I am willing to concede all that the pessimists are proclaiming about the evils of mechanization and standardization and if civilized societies were composed exclusively of weaklings and fools, I should agree with the pessimists in predicting the worst. But mechanization and standardization are not final; nor have they caught us napping. We are becoming awake to the dangers they threaten and are preparing to resist them. That makes all the difference. A race which has emerged from the ignorance and brutality of barbaric ages is quite capable of emerging from mechanization and standardization and will emerge, if brave men stand to it.

On the field of education especially, where, in my opinion, the main battle will have to be fought, we may see the process beginning under our very eyes. The machine and the standard, far from being final, are precisely what humanity needs to clear the way, prepare the ground and provide the means for a new outburst of creative activity. They furnish the best with means for consolidating and organizing its forces, with tools, weapons and commissariat for embarking on the next campaign against the worst. A mechanical age truly; but unless the omens are deceiving, the prelude to another, when men will do again what he has so often done in the past, by asserting his mastery over the conditions that confront him, and proving himself greater than any machine. Man is not so easily "standardized" as our Jeremiahs would have us believe.—*L. P. Jacks, Hibbert Journal.*

DEVELOPMENTS IN ALUMNI EDUCATION

FLORENCE H. SNOW

ALUMNAE SECRETARY AT SMITH COLLEGE

IT MUST have been courage born of the New Year as well as devotion to a favorite topic, that induced me blithely to accept this assignment.

First, I took a little time out to decide whether I had the heart to inflict another questionnaire on college presidents and alumni secretaries. And then almost immediately there arrived a reprint from the December BULLETIN of this Association, giving a symposium on "The Alumni Go to College." Behold here was my work already done! Here was the latest word on the latest developments in alumni education—direct testimony, vivid, inspiring.

This should have been reprieve enough, both for you and for me. But somehow, in spite of it, conscience drove me on. I was curious to see how the early literature, if one may call it that, would read some years after. I wanted to refresh my memory of the original ventures to see how far developments had really developed.

When I had the material assembled,—books and magazines, Proceedings of the American Alumni Council, newspaper clippings and all, five feet of shelf wouldn't begin to hold it. Fortunately as you must know, this alumni education is a recent movement, so recent that all its history could be rightly called "present development."

Every writer who begins at the beginning pays tribute to the inaugural address of President Hopkins in 1916 as the first public statement of the case. One wonders how startled his hearers were to be told that it was the duty of the college "to be of service to its men in their old age as in their youth," "to establish the procedure by which it can periodically throughout their lives give them opportunity to replenish their intellectual reserves." The audience may or may not have been conscious that it was standing at one of those "thresholds" which lead to new eras.

This seed planted at Dartmouth began to take root on more than one campus. It showed itself above ground at Amherst in 1919, when the first thoroughgoing experiment with conferences and reading lists was conceived. The growth of the idea was helped, of course, by the discovery that grown-ups could study to some purpose, and that there was likely to be a margin of leisure in which to do it. From the dictionary it became suddenly evident that an alumnus, strictly defined, was a "ward" or "pupil," and therefore entitled to lifelong instruction. Commencement was really a "commencement," invested though it had been with a "fictitious finality." One alumni editor is quoted as saying that "a college degree is after all only one degree up, and still a long way from the boiling point."

This was the day of the great million dollar drives for endowment and equipment of colleges and universities. In the preceding dark ages alumni had been undiscovered and uncultivated. Now as indispensable assets they were being not only discovered but tracked down.

In the minutes of the Association of Alumni Secretaries (the predecessor of the Alumni Council) as early as 1920 there are signs of rebellion against this exclusive use of alumni power for financial support. A paper on "A New 'Serious' Side of Alumni Work" suggests utilizing it for the educational good of the country. (To make the proposal less radical, the word "serious" is enclosed in quotation marks.)

But education in that sense is not what we now mean by alumni education. Nor is alumni education to be confused with that other important enterprise—the informing of alumni about the college, of keeping them constantly aware of its ideals and its methods. This is in one sense, of course, the training of alumni, and is fundamental and vital. It has been for some time and will continue to be standard practice in alumni work. But it does not imply *the encouragement of the personal intellectual life of the individual alumnus, with a continuation of his personal relation to his Alma Mater.* For the first time at the Alumni Secretaries' conference of 1922 there were a few specimens of this very new phase of alumni relations which could be pinned to the wall and critically examined. From then on, no annual meeting was without its paper on the subject.

Of special significance was the time in 1926 when several college presidents stepped down below the academic salt, where the alumni secretaries were struggling with the implications of the new diet, and "argued it out as sich."

Many of the veterans among the alumni workers were delighted at the turn of affairs. They were more than ready to cross new thresholds and arrive at new eras. They even professed to see the dawn of a renaissance in alumni relations. The glow might not be brilliant, but it seemed to herald a far brighter day. No longer would the alumnus after graduation, like a partly educated Indian, return to his blanket, oblivious of the things he had learned. No longer would his interest in his college center entirely around seats on the 50-yard line. At last the "end-product" would become a permanent member of the college family, concerned with the real purpose of his college, and receiving from it constant intellectual stimulation. Organized alumni work, these veterans thought, was bound to acquire a new and strengthening function.

Well, the renaissance *has* dawned, apparently. There is evidence enough in the body of alumni literature to make this statement safe. One could even go so far as to say that a certain article in the *Saturday Evening Post* last month was a little, just a little—behind the times in its failure to recognize what has happened. A great deal has happened, really. But it isn't yet fair to judge developments on a quantitative basis. The numbers and the percentages of those affected are still small. Faith is still the substance of things hoped for, numerically speaking.

It might be discouraging to the proponents of post-collegiate education to realize how few of the estimated three million graduates in the country are using their new opportunities. But nevertheless we can take comfort in the "peradventure ten." And also in the thought that this movement by its very nature needs quiet, gradual progress. If those who administer these highly experimental programs had to face thus soon the problem of great numbers, it would increase their difficulties. One institution this winter was somewhat staggered when the officers of a large reunion class contemplated supplanting its usual Commencement reunion by a return to the Alumnae College *en masse*. In the belief that the time was not yet ripe, with perhaps too much con-

servatism, the authorities did not encourage the plan. This very thing might come to pass however, and the suggestion of it is not the only sign that numbers will continue to grow.

The first attempt at a roll call of experiments was made in 1927, by a committee under the University of North Carolina. Forty institutions then stood up to be counted and classified as to their plans for guidance in reading, group instruction, "intellectual homecomings," radio addresses especially for alumni, and so on.

The next survey in 1929, by Wilfred Shaw of Michigan, under the direction of the American Association for Adult Education, was more intensive. This was the outgrowth of the joint conference of college administrators and alumni secretaries, called by that Association in 1928. Again a milestone: educators admitting that their institutions have a definite responsibility for continuing education, and recommending that the problem be brought to the attention of colleges and universities and their alumni groups in the hope that they might find opportunities of solving it.

In this 1929 survey, the experimental approach in forty-six institutions was studied and described in some detail. A year later, as Mr. Shaw looked over the field again, he saw a real advance in experiments and a growing recognition of the validity of the educational relationship.

By the time the Association for Adult Education collected data for its *Handbook* in 1932 and 1933, the number of experiments had grown appreciably. Of the 259 institutions which replied, 169 reported a varied list of activities: fifty-four of them alumni colleges, or conferences, or institutes; ninety-five, book lists; seventy-five, lecture service for clubs; eight, radio lectures; and 104, personal aid service from the faculty. In the *Handbook* sixty-one programs are summarized to illustrate the differing methods in use.

Present day reports indicate that, even in a short time, progress had definitely been gained. This is the more striking in view of the financial limitations. Programs for graduates could not easily be elaborated, while a shortage of undergraduates threatened. Indeed graduate programs could probably not have existed at all, if it had not been for the willingness of the faculty

to give their services or accept a nominal fee. Costs of administration have been kept down, too, by the service of alumni secretaries as directors of admission, registrars, bursars, room clerks, and caterers.

The number of institutions coming to the point of more or less timidly trying out some sort of educational plan is impressive. Only here and there have plans once launched been withdrawn. Lack of funds is usually the cause; occasionally it is the belief that some other agency could do the work better. (This is not a bad yardstick with which to measure the value of any project, by the way.)

In the types of program, the emphasis seems to have shifted somewhat away from Guidance in Reading. This was apt to be the initial and often the only kind, perhaps because it was the easiest. But the preparation of extraordinarily good lists is not always possible, and obstacles such as supplying books for readers inaccessible to libraries have to be overcome.

Under the heading of Programs of Instruction has appeared that novelty known as the Alumni College, invented by Lafayette in 1929, to our lasting gratitude. Its popularity has swept it into a permanent place in as many as twenty institutions, where enthusiastic not to say lyrical alumni pursue a course of study for several days or a week, just before or after Commencement, as a rule. Lawrence College schedules its Alumni College lectures on the mornings and early afternoons of its Commencement. At Hollins, an Alumnae Institute of two weeks' duration is held in the month of August. Michigan has just started a second session, off campus in vacation country during the summer.

(The Alumni College is given a thorough and impartial appraisal by Mr. Ralph Beals of the Adult Education Association in his book on *Aspects of Post-Collegiate Education*. The book was published in 1935, as the result of a study in the preceding year, but it is sure to remain invaluable for many years to come.)

Other interesting variations are coming to light. The December BULLETIN of this Association of American Colleges lists several of them. I wish there were time to talk of the addresses by heads of departments given monthly at the University of Denver; of the seminars twice a year at the New Jersey College for Women; of Brown's demonstration lectures in the field of science

staged in campus laboratories; of the fortnightly forums arranged by the University of Akron, for the discussion of current problems.

In most cases there is a growing use of the discussion method, either in round tables or panels. Vassar's post-Commencement forum is all discussion.

There seems to be a tendency toward a central unifying theme, like Mount Holyoke's *Current Aspects of Nationalism*, or Smith's series of countries.

For the most part the topics, whether unified or assorted, have been contemporaneous. But there are indications that attention may soon shift to history or at least to historical backgrounds. This will surely be true, if President Jessup's advice is taken, and immediacy gives way to continuity in the colleges themselves.

Recreational features of Alumni College programs are being subordinated as it is seen that the "students" have no country club propensities. They are so eager for instruction, on the other hand, that they object to missing even one lecture as they must when two are scheduled for the same hour.

Only recently have the lectures sometimes been printed for distribution to alumni other than those present. There are obvious difficulties of expense, and the wisdom seems doubtful of putting into permanent form lectures on anything so kaleidoscopic as current affairs.

In general, the programs are showing the result of a clearer perception of what this kind of education is and of the application of more and shrewder thought to the technique of administering it.

Evaluation is difficult, especially at this stage, as everyone confesses who has tried it. The word "imponderables" is being bandied about these days. Alumni education is heavily weighted with imponderables,—if that makes any sense! But these two things we do know, that benefits are deriving for the alumni who become students again and for the colleges. You may force an alumni secretary to admit that miracles have not yet happened. He will grant that the social, athletic, sentimental, and financial tie still binds, and probably always will and should. But from now on he insists that a definite place has to be made for this other kind of alumni relationship. And if he has ever managed

a successful alumni college, a fanatical light will come into his eye which means great satisfaction with the present and any amount of expectation for the future.

Perhaps in this type of education, unrestricted by marks and examinations, an entirely new method of teaching will evolve, something which will be at once both popular and scholarly, something perfectly adapted to the "intelligent amateur."

Suggestions can and should be gathered from those upon whom the experiment is being tried. They will know what they want and feel free to express it.

Alumni programs have got to be good programs, the best which college presidents can devise. There, in the hands of the administration the responsibility belongs. The alumni secretary can furnish the students, and attend to the janitation, but the curriculum, as someone has said, should not have any stigma of the alumni office about it. Alumni secretaries are not educators, but they do "admire" to work closely with them. This is perhaps one of their chief pleasures in post-collegiate education.

I turn to the dictionary for a word in conclusion. The theme of these two days has been "The Integrity of the American College." You have heard more than one excellent definition of integrity and how to get or maintain it. Webster defines "integrity" as "entire correspondence with an original condition; the state of being complete, undivided and unbroken." If the American college keeps its alumni in correspondence with their original condition, in other words, as students, then, I believe, the college will find its true *integrity*, complete, undivided, unbroken.

DEVELOPMENTS IN ALUMNI MONEY RAISING

CHARLES J. MIEL

GENERAL MANAGER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA FUND

ALUMNI FUNDS

A DISCUSSION of the development of alumni money-raising usually starts by recalling that the first alumni fund was organized by Yale in 1890. In the 275 preceding years of American college life large sums of money were raised from alumni mainly by college presidents, but there was no organized effort on the part of the alumni themselves.

I suppose one theory back of the creation of the alumni fund was that it would relieve the college president from a large part of his burden of constantly begging. My guess is, however, that with the advent of the alumni fund movement, no college president has been relieved in this respect. He has had the added responsibility of attending numerous conferences of alumni committees, supervising that new official—the alumni fund secretary—speaking at fund meetings, signing innumerable appeal letters, to say nothing of continuing to call on many prospective donors.

One result of all this extra motion is that a larger number of alumni have been reached than could have been approached by the college president acting alone. Sometimes also there seems to have been a helpful alumni *esprit de corps* developed but, unfortunately, in some instances this has also been accompanied by increased alumni interference in college administrative and academic affairs.

Whatever the merits and demerits of this typically American tendency to organize, I think all will agree that the Yale Plan has resulted in substantial sums being raised in many institutions where it has been tried, particularly at Amherst, Cornell and Dartmouth, which were among the earliest in the field. The Yale Fund itself has grown from an experiment that raised \$11,000 from 385 alumni in 1890 to a permanent organization that obtained from \$300,000 to \$500,000 a year from 8,000 to over 9,000 alumni in the nineteen-twenties.

As is generally known, there are now some one hundred alumni funds in existence all based on the principle of collecting annual

cash contributions. The purposes for which these funds have been used have varied at different colleges and from time to time in the same institutions. The most usual has been unrestricted funds for the immediate use of the college, with operating expenses for alumni associations and college endowment funds as the next most popular. Some other popular objectives are funds for student aid, faculty salaries and college buildings including a few alumni houses. The point is that the alumni fund is essentially a method of raising money irrespective of the ultimate use of the funds collected.

In many colleges the alumni fund has been under the jurisdiction of a separate committee, board or council of the Alumni Association. In a few institutions it has been run directly by the college administration. The most usual plan for solicitation has been the appointment of class representatives, called class agents, who circularize and in some cases personally call on a few of their classmates for gifts. In other funds the solicitation has been direct from the college or from the central alumni committee without the use of any intermediary agents.

THE INTENSIVE CAMPAIGN

Another type of alumni money-raising effort is the so-called intensive campaign. The first large one was conducted by Harvard in 1904 under the leadership of Bishop William A. Lawrence of the Episcopal Church of Massachusetts who was then President of the Harvard Alumni Association. This campaign resulted in raising \$2,400,000 from 2,000 Harvard alumni. Princeton followed in 1908 by completing a four and one-half year effort by obtaining \$4,000,000 which was, in turn, followed by the establishment of fund-raising organizations at Smith, Union, Brown, Wesleyan and North Carolina, all before 1915 when the University of Michigan alumni successfully completed a \$1,000,000 Union Building campaign.

During the War years there was a let-up in these activities but from 1919 on many new alumni funds were established, old ones revived and intensive campaigns carried on at many institutions. According to statistics of the John Price Jones Corporation from 1919 to 1926 almost \$69,000,000 was raised from 315,000 alumni in sixty-eight college campaigns.

RECENT TRENDS

This movement, like the stock market, kept right on going until 1929 when the intensive campaigns took a sudden drop but the alumni funds continued to increase until their peak was reached in 1930 when forty-five of the most active reported raising in that one year \$4,400,000 from 89,000 alumni, or an average gift of about \$38.00.

As one would naturally suppose, the intensive campaign practically disappeared in the depression years and the receipts in the next three years of the alumni funds from which we have reports decreased 60 per cent in amount, 25 per cent in the number of givers, with the average gift declining 72 per cent. The reports for 1934 showed a slight upturn of 8 per cent increase in the number of givers, but the amount obtained continued to decrease by 4.6 per cent compared with 1933 and the average gift fell off another 10.5 per cent. The returns for 1935 for forty-one alumni funds show an encouraging increase of 22 per cent in amount, 39 per cent in the number of givers, and a gain in the average gift of 12 per cent compared to these same funds in 1934.

Coinciding with this upturn of alumni funds, it has become evident that within recent months many leading institutions have been planning large scale fund-raising. All are familiar with the announcement of the Harvard Tercentenary Fund for distinguished service professorships, each to be endowed for \$500,000, and national scholarships of \$25,000 each; the Princeton campaign for \$7,750,000 for a new library, School of Public Affairs and scholarships, and at the University of Pennsylvania, a \$10,000,000 effort to culminate in its Two Hundredth Anniversary Year in 1940, with Bryn Mawr leading the procession by obtaining \$900,000 toward its \$1,000,000 Fiftieth Anniversary Fund.

BEQUEST PROGRAMS

Another development in alumni money raising is the seeking of bequests by organized alumni effort. Up to the formation of the Cornell Bequest Committee ten years ago this form of alumni support was like that for all alumni giving up to the turn of the century; that is, it was largely left to chance or to the initiative of college officials and yet there seems to be no reason why alumni

in the course of time cannot be educated to provide for their own colleges out of their estates in as great numbers and for as large donations as they have been educated to give while living. Perhaps one of the most important tasks for this movement is to dispel the idea that bequests must be large and are only possible for wealthy alumni.

The importance of this phase of giving cannot be over-emphasized. It is significant, for instance, that without any organized effort Harvard University lists over \$26,000,000 received in bequests, in endowment funds, and Yale records over \$45,000,000 received from bequests, among its trust funds.

This subject of bequests was so well covered at the Joint Conference of Colleges, Trust Institutions, Life Insurance and the Bar held under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges, in Philadelphia, in 1934, that a detailed account of these plans here would be a duplication. Suffice it to say that methods actually in practice in a score or more of colleges vary from the occasional visits of college field secretaries to trust offices or the mailing of an occasional pamphlet to selected lists of lawyers, trust officers and prospective testators, to the formation of large committees of alumni lawyers and smaller committees of trust officers, insurance representatives and alumni doctors who may have opportunities to interest their clients or patients in this form of giving.

At Pennsylvania we are trying an experiment by having our Bequest Program presented to the University Trustees, Alumni Boards and Fund Committees, asking each member to sign a card on which he indicates that he has made or will make some provision for the University in the settlement of his estate. Already, 90 per cent of one committee have signed such cards, and considerably more than half of the members of these other committees and boards.

CLASS INSURANCE

Another method is the raising of funds by means of class endowment insurance. This has been most successfully carried on at Princeton where, as a result of class campaigns, almost every member of every graduating class since 1916 has taken out a Twenty Year Endowment Insurance policy on his own life with the University as sole beneficiary, with the result that today there

are 5,254 alumni having such policies in force for a total amount of \$1,705,756. This record is even more remarkable when one learns that by use of small reserve class cash funds and accumulated dividends on policies in force no individual policies have been allowed to lapse.

A few other colleges have developed successful class insurance funds, notably Wells College, and others have combined this method with the seeking of cash contributions in building up twenty or twenty-five year class reunion gifts. At Harvard, for instance, the participant in an endowment insurance policy has the privilege of having his premium payment credited as an annual gift to the alumni fund.

Other colleges that have attempted to raise class insurance funds have met with little or no success. This has been true in many instances either because there is not a well-knit, enthusiastic class loyalty, or because the attempt has been to sell the insurance *en masse* to the class rather than through an intensive campaign of personal interviews carried on by an active class committee, or because of the lack of a good follow-up system in collecting premiums.

ANNUITIES

Another form of subscription developed especially by the womens' colleges is that of annuities. The purpose underlying the annuity agreement is for the donor to make a gift of principal to mature to the college upon his death, the donor to receive a specified yearly income on the principal as long as he lives. In general, it may be stated that if the agreed upon rate of annuity is sufficiently low, say not over 2.5 per cent, or if the gift of principal is invested by the college and only the amount earned thereon paid to the annuitant or, better yet, if the gift of principal is pooled with other trust funds of the college and the average rate of return of all these investments paid to the donor as an annuity, it would seem to be a fairly safe procedure. On the other hand, if college annuity contracts are to be at rates anything like those paid by insurance companies there is a grave danger of losing all the principal sum and having to pay the annuity on long-lived annuitants out of other sources, for the simple reason that no college can have enough annuitants to run this type of business on an actuarial basis and benefit by the law of averages.

To avoid this it has been recommended that colleges guaranteeing anything but the lowest annuity rates should reinsure their annuitants by purchasing annuities from insurance companies. For example, if an alumnus age sixty should make a principal gift of \$10,000 on which he was to be guaranteed a 5 per cent annuity, the college could buy a \$500 annuity for \$5,401* and have the balance of \$4,599 for immediate use. In 1931 it was estimated that college annuity funds amounted to well over \$20,000,000.

CORRELATING METHODS

It will be seen from this brief sketch of the development of alumni money-raising that a number of methods have been devised. In the literature on alumni fund-raising there are statements by college officials advocating the annual appeal of the alumni fund as the only plan for their institutions. Others have taken the point of view that the occasional intensive campaign should have its place in any long-term college money-raising policy. In this connection one reason, no doubt, why the development of bequest programs has been so long postponed is the fear that in seeking bequests the college would be interfering with obtaining funds for immediate use.

I used to hear Yale alumni speak with pride of their most successful alumni fund as a guarantee that Yale would never have to go into an intensive campaign, and yet Yale did undertake a campaign in 1927 and raised \$21,000,000, which was more than any other institution has raised in a similar effort up to this time. The thirty-seven years of the alumni fund must have been an important factor in this notable achievement.

I wonder sometimes if the enthusiasm for a particular type of fund plan as opposed to all others isn't based on that human tendency to become more and more enamored of the means of doing something than of the original end or objective which we have in view. We see men, for instance, stirred by a great ideal of religious truth and as time goes on they are apt to become more devoted to the church organization than the ultimate ideal. We start out in philanthropy to help orphans and we put up buildings and then we become devoted to the building or a particular

* These figures are based on annuity rates of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States issued in 1930. It should be borne in mind that annuity rates have increased since that date.

institution, and we get rather peeved if there aren't enough orphans to fill the place.

While I cannot speak for any other institution except my own, we at Pennsylvania consider the alumni fund as merely a means toward an end but not in any way the only means, and that the greatest value of our Annual Giving Fund is its power to create and sustain alumni interest in the needs and plans of the college, and to form the habit of giving.

Pennsylvania had an intensive campaign in 1925-26, followed by the establishment of our permanent Alumni Annual Giving Fund in 1927, and now hopes to raise an Alumni \$3,000,000 Bi-Centennial Endowment fund as a part of the announced \$10,000,000 campaign. All gifts made by the alumni to the campaign will be credited as alumni fund gifts in the year in which the payments are made and the entire alumni fund organization of 328 class agents will be used as a basis on which to build the intensive alumni campaign organization. We also expect to promote our Bequest Program during the intensive campaign period and anticipate no conflict in so doing.

A number of institutions have conducted successful intensive campaigns as well as alumni funds including Amherst, Bowdoin, Brown, Bryn Mawr, Cornell, Chicago, Harvard, Marietta, Mt. Holyoke, Northwestern, Wesleyan and Wooster.

It seems to me that an important factor for any institution in establishing a long-term fund-raising policy is providing the proper coordination of all fund-raising activities. I note, for instance, that there are only perhaps fifteen institutions in the country in which all the money raising is under one central organization. The reason for this is that the alumni fund has grown up under the auspices of the alumni association so that the college administration is often at the same time or on occasion seeking funds from alumni. At Northwestern University and, more recently, at Rutgers they have established centralized university offices for all phases of development and public relation work including the entire alumni and fund-raising set-ups and activities for interesting prospective students.

ALUMNI ORGANIZATION

This points to a fundamental factor for all alumni money-raising which is too often neglected until the time of an intensive

effort. That is the developing and maintaining of a strong national alumni organization. If this can be accomplished by the existing alumni association without financial assistance from the college it is indeed a fortunate situation, but if a subsidy is necessary, carefully worked-out organization plans may prove to be a profitable investment of college funds. In a survey of the American Alumni Council in 1930 it was found that over one-half of the alumni associations then functioning depended on their colleges for more than 50 per cent of their overhead expenses and that twenty-one were entirely supported by the college. These figures in most cases do not include the cost of alumni magazines which are largely supported by subscriptions and advertising.

Most colleges in large cities have been slow to recognize the importance of national alumni organizations because of the preponderance of their alumni living close at hand, but some institutions located in the country, notably Cornell and Dartmouth, have invested large sums on building up alumni clubs which are already paying good dividends to the college through additional alumni financial support.

Costs

This suggests the question of expenses of alumni money-raising which I am not able to discuss adequately for the simple reason that I know of no detailed information available that has yet been made public, but from what I do know, I venture the following generalization:

1. The raising of funds from large numbers of alumni is more expensive than the more concentrated effort pointed toward a smaller number of wealthier prospects.
2. The successful alumni fund in proportion to its yearly return is more expensive than the successful intensive campaign but it should be borne in mind that one result of alumni funds may be the best possible preparation for intensive campaigns for the future and for bequests.
3. The cost of alumni money-raising on the whole either on a permanent or occasional basis is usually less than similar fund-raising efforts for religious, civic, public-health, child-helping and other philanthropic purposes with the exception of the best community chest campaigns.

The sixty-eight college campaigns completed between 1919 and 1926 showed an average cost of 3.4 per cent of the amount raised.

ALUMNI FUND SURVEY

In discussing the various types of alumni fund organizations I have drawn largely on a publication of the American Alumni Council, entitled "An Alumni Fund Survey" issued in 1932, of which the late Harold Flack, of Cornell, was editor, and our presiding officer, Mr. Grisette, the leading contributor. For any one contemplating a change of fund-raising methods this book should, I think, prove of greatest value.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

In conclusion let us look for a moment at the present situation. We see that both the alumni fund and the intensive campaign are showing an increased activity. Over the past several years we have heard predictions from some quarters that education in the future can no longer depend on large contributions. If this prediction is sound, it should have a marked effect on the fund-raising methods of the future. It recalls to my mind the opposite attitude which so many held in the prosperous years of big business immediately preceding the present depression, when we were so often told that America was in a new era, that millionaires would become more and more numerous and that consequently philanthropy would continue to increase. I wonder if, at the present time, our tendency is to underestimate what the future holds for educational philanthropy just as we erred a few years ago when we assumed that times then were normal.

Acting President Marts of Bucknell University in an article on this subject appearing in *School and Society*, December, 1934, points out that we have no certain knowledge yet of how far the so-called "New Deal" will go in changing the traditional American life, and also that in a study made in 1929 of individuals paying Federal Income Taxes only 1.9 per cent was deducted for charitable gifts of all kinds out of the 15 per cent deduction allowed.

We have recently read of the \$2,000,000 Littauer gift to Harvard and the \$500,000 donation of Mr. Thomas Lamont for the first of the distinguished service professorships of the Harvard

Tercenary Fund. Certainly no one institution possesses all the generous millionaires among its alumni, and I heartily agree with Mr. Marts that it is poor strategy for philanthropic leaders to publicize that a steady flow of gifts from alumni, moderate in amount but large in number is the only hope of contributions in the years that lie ahead of us. As he states, the effect of this attitude on large prospective donors is bad, for they need stimulation and inspiration to give rather than ready-made excuses for not doing so. Its effect on the rank and file of donors is equally bad, for they cannot be inspired to give more generously by the plea that persons better able to give will or can do so no longer.

In this connection we have heard a great deal about the effect of recent tax legislation on donations. Many people are under the impression that the Federal Gift Tax applies to gifts made to charitable and educational organizations. This is, of course, not true. The very words "gift tax" are a misnomer if one thinks in terms of taxing gifts to philanthropic organizations.

To be sure the Federal and State Governments are taking a much larger proportion of incomes in the higher brackets for taxation purposes but, by the same token, a gift which is exempt costs the donor less because of the higher rate of tax. A married man, for instance, with a net income of \$70,000 in 1935 could have made a gift of \$10,000 to an educational institution at the cost of \$6,135, as he would have saved \$3,865 on his Federal Income Tax. In 1936 the same individual will be able to make the same gift at the cost of \$5,850.

We all realize that the average wealthy alumnus feels poor these days and is poor compared to 1929, but we also should remember that he is still at the top of the financial ladder in comparison with the alumnus of moderate circumstances. I suppose that it is about as popular to feel poor today as it was to be considered a man of means in the nineteen-twenties, all of which points to the need for a greater effort in raising money. A successful campaign today needs a more perfect analysis of the college needs, a more inspiring presentation of these needs to the alumni, a better soliciting organization and a more adequate combing of the lists in an attempt to find new sources of wealth. In plain words—harder work all around.

But does this necessarily mean more drudgery? I don't think so. I am reminded of the words of Daniel Webster in the famous

Dartmouth College case, "It is a small college, but there are those who love her." Alumni money-raising is a small part of the life of any college but there are those who love it because they love the college and because it presents exceptional opportunities to interpret the ideals and aims of the present-day college to her former students.

Let me close by quoting a man who, during a very active life, has made this kind of work his most interesting hobby. I refer to Bishop Lawrence who, in an article entitled "An Invigorating Avocation," in the September *Atlantic* of 1923, recalls a conversation with President Eliot about a \$1,000,000 campaign the Bishop was about to enter. Dr. Eliot said, "It is very hard work, do you hope to raise that amount?" The Bishop replied, "I hope so. It is hard work and a heavy strain. One must be fit and on edge every moment. I hate the job at a distance but when I once get started, trout fishing is not in it for excitement. You strike what is called a 'deep pool' and no fish rises and you go back to camp depressed. You cast into a shallow and almost hopeless pool and come away with big game. You have all the fun of gambling and do not gamble."

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY recently announced a gift estimated in excess of \$7,000,000 from the estate of Roger Deering, who died February 2, 1936. The gift was unrestricted in character. The Board of Trustees has decided to add it to the general endowment funds, the income to be used to strengthen the teaching program of the University.

This bequest is said to be the largest single gift made to higher education since 1932 when the late George Eastman left \$14,000,000 to the University of Rochester. The Deering family has long been interested in Northwestern, its total gifts since 1876 amounting to more than \$10,300,000.

LAY PARTICIPATION IN ALUMNI ORGANIZATION

EDNA LEE WOOD

PRESIDENT OF THE SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION

I WOULD like to analyze with you this fearsome title Mr. Grisette has given me,—“Lay Participation in Alumni Organization.” What is it? What kind of it do we want? How can we get it? How can we use it?

So, first, what is it? If I may be so bold I will say to you that lay participation is alumni organization. That I fear is a fact too often ignored. Many of us are apt to feel that with a competent staff in the alumni office our problems are at an end, but did you ever stop to consider what would happen to all the work of this competent staff if there were no cooperation from your alumni body? No matter how excellent your magazine, it would be neither subscribed for nor read; no matter what intriguing questionnaires were prepared on graduate activity, they would not be answered; no matter what heart-rending pleas were evolved, there would be no subscribers to the alumni fund; and no matter how good the football team, or how cheap the tickets, good old Siwash would battle before almost empty stands were it not for alumni participation and cooperation.

But all these, of course, reduce alumni cooperation to an almost absurd point. What we really mean when we speak of “lay participation” is the leadership of the “amateur alumnus” in projects of the college and the alumni association.

If now, in coming to our second point, we ask what kind of leadership we want from our alumni, I think we can sum up our desires in three words—intelligent, informed, enthusiastic. Intelligence depends almost entirely on the individual and we may hope that the majority of graduates of our several colleges could fulfill that requirement. But the “informed” and “enthusiastic” parts can, to a large extent, be manufactured, and if the college is at all worth while, they will be inseparable.

I'd like to digress here for just a moment on one of my pet theories. You will note I said, “If the college is worth while,” not if the alumni association is worth while. I think many of us who are interested in alumni work are apt to forget that the col-

lege, and not the alumni association, is and should be the important thing. The alumni association is vitally important, but without the college it has no reason for existence. It could not exist without the college and the college must be our main interest if we are to be successful. In his Valedictory to the Class of 1934 President Hopkins of Dartmouth said, "Tomorrow begins a new relationship between Dartmouth and yourselves. In the large, the mutual positions will be reversed. Instead of the College, being responsible for your welfare, you will become responsible for that of the College." This responsibility for the welfare of the college should be ever present in the mind of an alumnus, be he a layman or a professional in the field, and I hope you will realize that however far we may digress to discuss ways and means, I still feel that this idea should motivate all alumni work.

And now back to this informed and enthusiastic leadership by lay alumni. Our third question is, How can we get it? Please don't think me facetious when I say the first answer is, "Ask for it." I mean it. Don't wait for the ideal person to come along. Human nature being what it is and the demands of this twentieth century being what we think they are, you will have a long and not very happy wait. And the second answer is, "Educate your alumni." Hunt out your person, and by giving him the right information, make him enthusiastic. Look over your lists, geographical and class, and pick out people you think would be valuable. The old theory that the easiest way to win over a complainer or a non-interested person is to give him a job is just as applicable to alumni work as it is to class organization in college or politics outside. It is often more satisfactory to ask him to help in a college matter first, it flatters his ego, and then again if the interest in the college is firmly founded, that in the Alumni Association will follow. There are a dozen tactful ways in which you can ask him to work for you.

For example—you decide Mary Jones, or Tom Jones if you will (I know more about Mary, so I'll take her), is a person you would like to have active in your association; perhaps you would like her for a particular job, perhaps you merely want a little more of her money. You might start by sending her a letter from the Admissions Office saying there are several girls from her city registered for college, and would she be willing to answer any per-

sonal questions they might have. Or the college president might write her asking her to attend a certain meeting and report it to her (not too important a meeting at first!). Or the college publicity director might write her asking which of the newspapers published in her city seems to be most important from the standpoint of college news. There are other ways. But the important fact about each of these approaches is that it gives you the opportunity to send Mary information about the college, and incidentally about the alumni association. If, as in the first instance, she is to answer questions prospective students are apt to ask her, she will need a catalogue, books of views, copies of student and alumni publications; if she is to attend a meeting on an educational subject she will need reports which give the position of her college on the points to be discussed; or if she is to give an answer as to which newspaper would be best for college news, she will be interested in sample press releases. Send letters with all these mailings, tell Mary how glad you are she is doing this job, ask her to write you how she feels about it, ask her for suggestions. You may be sure she will read the material you have sent her with much more interest than if it had come with no special reference to a particular subject. Get her to write to you and you have made a start. Exchange three or four letters and you are usually safe.

It is now only a short step to asking Mary's advice on alumnae problems and, much sooner than you would expect, getting good answers. You say it seems like a lot of work? It is, and it takes an excellent alumni secretary to engineer it, but it's worth it, because in nine cases out of ten the following year will see Mary attending her local club meetings regularly and organizing a committee to interview prospective students; or reporting on more important meetings and perhaps writing articles on them for the alumni magazine, or working on the alumni fund committee because she has learned how badly a new gymnasium is needed. If she does work on the alumni fund this is a golden opportunity to send her more information in the form of handbooks for class agents, frequent letters from the fund director, sample letters other class agents have used and fund reports from other colleges. Urge her to come to Commencement or reunion to attend a special meeting of fund agents, or a special meeting of people working

with prospective students, or a special meeting of club presidents, or club secretaries, or what you will,—but urge her to come, and when she gets there give her more information! Keep furnishing it until she is able to search it out for herself, and even then keep her on the list for regular notices from the college.

And now to our fourth point, How can we use this intelligent, informed, enthusiastic lay leadership? Obviously it should not extend to any of the key positions in the Alumni Association such as alumni secretary, fund director or magazine editor, because we all know the uncertainty of volunteer help in positions which require sustained hard work and efficiency over long periods, but in every other field of alumni activity I feel it can be used and with excellent results.

A responsible and informed alumnus may be used, and satisfactorily, as a representative to "Go to College Days" in local prep schools, as a liaison officer between the college publicity bureau and local newspapers, as a speaker at alumni club meetings in cities near his own, as a director or organizer of alumni clubs as well as the many more obvious ways such as club president, class secretary, officer of the Alumni Association and finally, alumni member of the Board of Trustees of the college.

Because our alumni bodies are composed of laymen they should have lay leadership in so far as is practicable, just as the student bodies in our colleges should have student leadership to that same extent. The off-the-campus viewpoint is important. The thought, "If he can do it along with his job,—or she can do it along with her home, or her children, perhaps I can too," is often the deciding factor in a new recruit's mental process.

Many of you will ask, "Cannot the same results be accomplished by more workers in the alumni office?" I am convinced that the answer is "No." And to your question, "Is it worth the trouble, the education, the frequent checking-up?" I have no hesitancy in saying, "Yes."

Because, and this is the bright side of the picture, an interested body of lay leaders such as we have discussed usually grows by its own momentum and takes upon its shoulders many of the chores formerly thought necessary parts of the work of the alumni office. At the risk of making this sound like an "experience meeting" I would like to tell you some of the ways we, at Sweet Briar, are using lay alumnae.

Each year December twenty-eighth means, to a Sweet Briar graduate, Sweet Briar Day. This year we had eighty-two Sweet Briar alumnae meetings in various cities in different parts of the world. For many years it was the work of the alumnae secretary to arrange these Sweet Briar Day meetings, appoint chairmen for the different cities and help plan the programs. Two years ago it was decided that a lay alumna could be used for this work and the idea has proven satisfactory beyond our most optimistic hopes.

One lay alumna was last year sent on a trip to eight large cities in the Mid-West and South, speaking at the alumnae club in each city and at a total of nineteen prep schools as well, thus dividing the expenses for the Alumnae Association and the Admissions Office.

One of our smaller alumnae clubs, which by the way was organized through the work of a lay alumna, has become especially interested in contacting the girls' preparatory schools in its vicinity. The work of its members has now progressed to such a point that they work directly with the Admissions Office instead of through the alumnae secretary. At one time last year when they wished to have a tea for the senior and junior classes of several schools they learned that all of the College's exhibits of photographs, albums and so on which are usually available for such prospective student work, were to be in use. But that didn't stop them. They cut pictures from their various *Annals*, corresponded with the book shop and the managers of student publications on the campus, collected old movie films, and made their own exhibit which compares very favorably with the "professional" ones the college offers.

For the past two years we have used a lay alumna as publicity director for our alumnae fund. This girl, although she lives in the Mid-West and is able to return to the campus only once a year, has been one of the most valuable members of our staff. She has visited all of the colleges within a driving radius of her home and talked fund publicity with their fund directors. She has searched out men and women in her city who are, or have been, workers on the funds of their various colleges and has listened to their ideas. She even made several special stops while on a European trip last summer to talk fund to Sweet Briar graduates liv-

ing abroad. Hardly a week passes that the alumnae office does not receive a communication of some sort from her. It frequently says, "This may not do for us, or perhaps we can't afford it, but it's an idea anyway." Those of you who work in alumnae offices know what joy an idea—good or bad—can bring to your souls!

A non-professional alumni leader can never replace the paid alumni executive. He could never understand the intricacies of, or the reasons for much of the work unless he made it a full-time job, and in so doing his value would be lost. But he has, I feel sure, a definite place. I know you will enjoy using him and I know he will enjoy being used. I hope you will try him.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE for Endowments held a meeting at The Roosevelt immediately following the Annual Meeting of the Association. President Harold C. Jaquith of Illinois College succeeds President William Mather Lewis as Chairman of the Institute. The other members of the Committee on Colleges of the Institute, according to the report submitted by Mr. Leroy A. Mershon, the director, are:

William Mather Lewis, President of Lafayette College; Charles E. Beury, President of Temple University; Meta Glass, President of Sweet Briar College; R. B. Von KleinSmid, President of the University of Southern California; Robert R. Clothier, President of Rutgers University; John S. Nollen, President of Grinnell College; Joseph H. Willitts, Dean of the Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania.

John A. Stevenson of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia remains the chairman of the Committee on Life Insurance; Gilbert T. Stephenson, chairman of the Committee on Trust Institutions; and Silas H. Strawn of Chicago, chairman of the Committee on the Bar.

MORE RECENT COLLEGE PLANS—REPORT OF SECTION "C"

GEORGE B. CUTTEN

PRESIDENT OF COLGATE UNIVERSITY

EDITORIAL NOTE: The Plans of Colgate, Southwestern, Bard, Skidmore, Hiram, and the University of Florida were presented in this section at 2:30 Thursday afternoon. Each college has printed matter fully describing its Plan, available on application to the President.—*R. L. K.*

THE REPORT from the meeting on Section C is that we had a large attendance, keen interest, every speaker kept within his time, and we had splendid cooperation right through.

There seemed to be a feeling on the part of those interested in recent college plans that we had no objection to those who wish to bask in the indolent and cozy comfort of tradition, but on the other hand we saw no reason why, because certain methods and material were used in the Middle Ages, that for no other reason they should be continued in use.

The most interesting thing about it was not the substance of the different plans, but the fact that there were a great many different plans. In other words, that the educational world has awakened and that people are looking around and seeing if there cannot be some improvement on present conditions, as that is the only possible way to make any progress.

We found, or the opinion was expressed, that the plans cannot be the same for large universities as for small colleges, nor can they be the same for the small colleges as for all large universities, and that the plans are tentative because it takes from fifty to five hundred years to make an experiment in education; consequently the best that we can do is to try these things out for the benefit of posterity.

There was a feeling that some of the plans may be quite expensive, but on the other hand that it was possible to make some changes that might be of benefit along the newer lines without any additional cost. There has been a wide adaptation of the surveys or general introductory courses, about one hundred and fifty colleges using them now, and many inquiries have been made concerning them. It is recognized that these are the antidote for

too much specialization, but the trouble is, on the other hand, that there are no survey courses published, that there are no teachers prepared to teach them, and that courses must be written and that the teachers must be trained.

The comprehensive examinations were spoken of by several of the men and commented on favorably. However, I think there was a general feeling among those who were present that if you have a good teacher, it does not matter much whether you have a plan or not, and if you have a poor teacher it does not matter very much whether you have a plan or not. But there are only one-tenth enough good teachers to go around, and if it is possible to supplement the poor teaching by a plan that may be of some value, why, of course, that will be helpful in the matter of education.

Among the finest of our free institutions, and most resistive to political domination, are our privately supported colleges and universities. In them the free play of thought finds its most favorable environment. Because they can afford to entertain conflicting viewpoints soberly and objectively, their tendency is towards social balance and orderly growth. In addition to motive power, they provide in a politically confused society a balance-wheel which no state controlled institution can supply.

From the nature of their individual circumstances, private colleges and universities as a class are in a better position to pioneer toward higher standards of learning and more effective methods of teaching than those dependent upon state or local taxation. America needs both types of institutions; but it is imperative at this time . . . that we conserve and advance the position of our privately endowed institutions of learning as pioneers in ideas of which the state institutions and the state itself, as well as society generally, are ultimately to be the beneficiaries.—*Annual Report, 1935, Harold W. Dodds.*

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR THE YEAR 1935-36

ROBERT L. KELLY

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION :

ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE

Relations with the Federal Government

The personnel and machinery of the Association office have been centered much of the time during the year upon relationships with the Federal Government. Other agencies have participated in the efforts to protect the interests of the colleges. Many college executives have labored to the same ends. The main results may be summarized in this way:

The Federal Social Security Act exempts all non-profit schools and colleges.

The Federal Revenue Act of 1935 exempts all non-profit schools and colleges.

The Inheritance Tax feature of the Federal Revenue Bill failed to become a law.

Corporations are allowed 5 per cent exemption from Federal revenue taxes on gifts to charitable institutions and organizations.

A Federal appropriation was made for grants-in-aid to 120,000 young men and women who otherwise could not attend college.

Tax Service

Especial study has been given to the tax situation in the various states, as it may affect the interests of member institutions. As a result, the Executive Committee has authorized the establishment of a Special Tax Service for member colleges by which all changes and proposed changes in either state or Federal taxation which may affect the colleges will be brought to their attention. As aids in this service the Association office has an arrangement with an authoritative agency which receives daily telegraphic information from the various capitals throughout the country and the Association will have periodic reports from this agency. The Association office also has the advice of highly qualified counselors at law, in finance and in insurance for the interpretation of individual situations. The Tax Service will be free to those

member colleges that ask for it. Information will not be broadcast, except that in such cases as those of impending legislation in any state, member colleges in that state will be advised of the proposed changes in the law.

**Advisory and
Architectural
Service**

The general Advisory Service of the office has met heavy demands. The special Architectural Service is "coming back," as building programs are being resumed. Delegates and the public are invited to inspect the architectural exhibit arranged for this meeting by our architectural adviser.

BULLETIN

The Association BULLETIN has been improved in quality and the circulation greatly extended. There are at the moment this report is issued 117 subscriber clubs in thirty-five states. Especial reference may be made to major contributions by the office in the fields of curriculum building and alumni relationships.

**Inter-Association
Relationships**

Inter-association relationships with ten or twelve other agencies of national scope have been maintained.

The Association office has cooperated with the postal authorities in the investigation of the "puff" magazines. It was recently reported to this office that half a dozen of these magazines had been put out of business.

**Regional
Conferences**

During the months of October and November three regional conferences were conducted by the Association with the aid of local committees. These were held at Wichita, Beloit College, and Atlanta. There was good attendance and active participation by representatives of the colleges. Three new features characterized the method of these conferences: (a) there was a general coordination among the conferences of problems under consideration; (b) there was an almost complete coordination as between the conferences on the one hand and the current publications of the Association, on the other; (c) representatives of kindred associations were invited to appear on the programs and to join in the discus-

sions. The associations represented were the Progressive Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, the American Library Association, the American Alumni Council, the Kansas Conference of Church-Related Colleges, the Southern Association, the North Central Association, the National Youth Administration. With a few exceptions, the representatives of these associations were also members of the Association of American Colleges.

Conferences conducted under such conditions, it is believed, cannot fail to aid in concentrating and solidifying the forces of liberal education.

**Headquarters
Office**

An event of considerable consequence during the year was the moving of the office headquarters to 19 West 44th Street. The move was made to accommodate our members in that we now offer them a much more accessible location. We invite members to call at the new office and ask, as a special favor, that all mailing lists be corrected.

Coincident with this move was the taking over by the office of the bookkeeping work which had heretofore been done by the Bank of New York and Trust Company.

Throughout the meeting of the Association, a temporary office is established on this floor of the hotel for your convenience.

**Radio
Broadcast**

This afternoon from 5:15 to 5:30 there will be a coast to coast radio broadcast over the Columbia network by President Wriston, and President McConaughy of Wesleyan University, Chairman of the Association's Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, on the question of academic freedom with special reference to the oaths which are now being required of college instructors by various legislatures.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

**Academic Free-
dom and Aca-
demic Tenure**

The Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure has been very active, and favorable attention is called to its report, submitted at this session.

College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts

Under the auspices of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts and the sponsorship of the special Music Committee, the study of music in the colleges has been completed, and copies of the report, in the form of a book entitled *College Music* by Randall Thompson, have been sent to all member colleges. The book has aroused unusual interest. It will be considered in Section A this afternoon, along with other topics within the realm of the fine arts. After all bills were paid for the Study, a balance of \$665.44 was transferred to the special funds of the Association.

Enlistment and Training of College Teachers

Progress will be reported at this session in the Survey of College Faculties by Professor B. W. Kunkel, of Lafayette College. In this study 4,700 college professors are participating.

Enrolment of Students

The Committee on the Enrolment of Students makes its final report at this meeting and asks to be discharged.

Public Service Personnel

The Chairman of the newly created Committee on Public Service Personnel will offer a brief outline of possibilities in that field. The Association is joining some seventy-five other groups in an effort which has been christened "A United Front for Better Government Personnel." The Association's Committee consists of Dean A. C. Hanford, of Harvard College, Chairman, Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University, President Tyler Dennett, Williams College, and Professor Marshall E. Dimock, of the University of Chicago.

Insurance and Annuities

The Committee on Insurance and Annuities will make its first report at this session, devoted largely to projected forms of service. The responsibility of the colleges for setting up forms of security for their officers and teachers, such as insurance, annuities, employment plans, is all the greater now that the Federal Government exempts them from the provisions of the Social Security Law. The new Committee consists of Controller J. C. Christen-

sen, of the University of Michigan, Chairman, Treasurer Horace S. Ford, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, President John S. Nollen, Grinnell College, President John L. Seaton, Albion College. At the request of the Executive Committee, President Henry James, of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, is serving in an advisory capacity to the Committee.

During the period while the Annual Meeting is in session, the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, with permanent offices at 522 Fifth Avenue, will have an office on this floor of the hotel open for consultation, with reference to insurance, annuities, etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Suspension of Commissions

The Executive Committee recommends that for the present the Commissions on Educational Surveys, on Permanent and Trust Funds, and the Committees on Enrolment of Students and Federal Legislation be suspended.

Change in By-Laws

The Executive Committee recommends that Section 1 of the By-Laws of the Association, which defines eligibility to membership in terms of units and semester hours be omitted, and that Section 2 be made the first section, and the remaining six By-Laws be re-numbered accordingly.

New Members

The Executive Committee nominates the following colleges for admission to membership in the Association:

Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
Berry College, Mount Berry, Ga.
College Misericordia, Dallas, Pa.
Du Quesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa.
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs, N. C.
Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo.
Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.
Kentucky State Industrial College, Frankfort, Ky.

College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts

Under the auspices of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts and the sponsorship of the special Music Committee, the study of music in the colleges has been completed, and copies of the report, in the form of a book entitled *College Music* by Randall Thompson, have been sent to all member colleges. The book has aroused unusual interest. It will be considered in Section A this afternoon, along with other topics within the realm of the fine arts. After all bills were paid for the Study, a balance of \$665.44 was transferred to the special funds of the Association.

Enlistment and Training of College Teachers

Progress will be reported at this session in the Survey of College Faculties by Professor B. W. Kunkel, of Lafayette College. In this study 4,700 college professors are participating.

Enrolment of Students

The Committee on the Enrolment of Students makes its final report at this meeting and asks to be discharged.

Public Service Personnel

The Chairman of the newly created Committee on Public Service Personnel will offer a brief outline of possibilities in that field. The Association is joining some seventy-five other groups in an effort which has been christened "A United Front for Better Government Personnel." The Association's Committee consists of Dean A. C. Hanford, of Harvard College, Chairman, Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University, President Tyler Dennett, Williams College, and Professor Marshall E. Dimock, of the University of Chicago.

Insurance and Annuities

The Committee on Insurance and Annuities will make its first report at this session, devoted largely to projected forms of service. The responsibility of the colleges for setting up forms of security for their officers and teachers, such as insurance, annuities, employment plans, is all the greater now that the Federal Government exempts them from the provisions of the Social Security Law. The new Committee consists of Controller J. C. Christen-

sen, of the University of Michigan, Chairman, Treasurer Horace S. Ford, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, President John S. Nollen, Grinnell College, President John L. Seaton, Albion College. At the request of the Executive Committee, President Henry James, of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, is serving in an advisory capacity to the Committee.

During the period while the Annual Meeting is in session, the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, with permanent offices at 522 Fifth Avenue, will have an office on this floor of the hotel open for consultation, with reference to insurance, annuities, etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Suspension of Commissions

The Executive Committee recommends that for the present the Commissions on Educational Surveys, on Permanent and Trust Funds, and the Committees on Enrolment of Students and Federal Legislation be suspended.

Change in By-Laws

The Executive Committee recommends that Section 1 of the By-Laws of the Association, which defines eligibility to membership in terms of units and semester hours be omitted, and that Section 2 be made the first section, and the remaining six By-Laws be re-numbered accordingly.

New Members

The Executive Committee nominates the following colleges for admission to membership in the Association:

Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
Berry College, Mount Berry, Ga.
College Misericordia, Dallas, Pa.
Du Quesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa.
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs, N. C.
Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo.
Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.
Kentucky State Industrial College, Frankfort, Ky.

Marshall College, Huntington, West Va.
 Mt. Mercy College, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison, Kans.
 St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J.
 Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.
 Texas College, Tyler, Texas
 University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
 University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

**Subscriptions to
 CHRISTIAN
 EDUCATION**

The Executive Committee recommends that the Association continue to pay subscriptions to CHRISTIAN EDUCATION for all member colleges making request in writing that this be done.

**Book of
 Procedure**

The Executive Committee has instructed the Executive Secretary to prepare and develop a "book of procedure," which, as part of an official "audit of experience," shall contain the principal precedents which have been established during the history of the Association, as well as other major phases of the Association's work.

The Executive Committee has authorized the Executive Secretary to continue his investigation of the theory and practice of concentration during the last two years of the college course, as a special field of study.

**Study of the
 Master's
 Degree**

The Executive Committee, at the request of the American Council on Education, has nominated the following members of the Association to participate as advisers in a study of the conditions under which the A.M. degree is granted by American colleges: Sister Jeanne Marie, College of St. Catherine, President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University, Dean Goodrich C. White, Emory University, Professor Arnold Dresden, Swarthmore College.

**Study of
 College
 Fraternities**

The Executive Committee advises that the Association look forward with interest to the development of plans by the American Council on Education for a study of the educational value of college fraternities.

**Music
Projects**

The Executive Committee reports that a well-known Foundation has volunteered to finance certain projects under the direction of the Association of American Colleges. These projects are as follows:

(1) The preparation of a book dealing with the imponderables of college music, as a companion study to Thompson's *College Music*, which deals with curriculum problems.

(2) That a service be established by the Association whereby musical talent of a high order be secured for colleges, it being understood that the Association has no talent to sell but will work only as a buying and distributing agency.

(3) That the Association undertake the administration of an intercollegiate Glee Club organization, the purpose being to hold college Glee Club contests and in other ways to promote this type of high grade performance among college students.

(4) That the Association assume the responsibility of administering a system of grants-in-aid to present or prospective college music teachers of exceptional talent and promise.

**Library
Project**

The same Foundation has authorized the prosecution of an investigation of methods of coordinating the work of college libraries and the educational programs of the colleges, to the end that the library may become an agency of college teaching of the highest possible significance and value.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE*

Now the theme of this conference, as you know, is the integrity of the American college. It appears that this is the psychological moment for the consideration of this theme and it means in a word that the liberal college shall remain liberal, or shall become liberal if the liberal college is now liberal only in name. It is not that the Executive Committee is proposing that a reactionary step be taken. This step is a progressive step.

It is believed that the liberal college knows what it ought to do and it ought to proceed to doing it more effectively than it has ever done before. It certainly ought to acquaint the student

* A stenographic report.

somewhat with what man has done, that is history; with what man has thought, that is philosophy; with what man has found out, that is science; with what man has created, that is art; with what man has felt and expressed, that is literature; with what man has worshipped, that is religion. But liberal education having the past achievements of the race as a background must have an outward and a forward look. The integrity—the oneness of the American college, will not be achieved if knowledge of subject matter alone is the end of the process. Liberal education must be expressed in functional as well as structural terms. It must help the student and the society which the student in turn is to help to re-create. The liberal college seeks to develop the texture of mind which must be at the basis of future civilization; the mind characterized by keenness, forcefulness, tolerance, comprehensiveness, generosity, understanding. Involved in the integrity of the college is not only the intellectual completeness and flexibility to which this meeting is dedicated, but financial and moral completeness, which are implied, if not in this meeting made so explicit.

We wish to produce men and women, I think, who are able to meet occasions. We are not preparing men for specific tasks. We are preparing men for any kind of a task which may come to them as the years go on. We are attempting in the liberal colleges to educate men and women, not to train men and women. The training of men and women belongs to other agencies. It does not belong to the liberal college. The liberal college has to do with education.

The Association of American Colleges is interested in the fundamental adjustments, not in patent medicines, not in pulling rabbits out of the hat. The Association of American Colleges is interested in teaching students to avoid immediacy and to cultivate continuity in their lives. The Association of American Colleges, as I understand it (perhaps I am mistaken) believes in the enduring experiences of the human race and would prepare students for enduring experiences. This is a place of high strategy, if there is any place of that sort among the educational associations of the United States.

That the theme is not a demand alone for traditional subject-matter, traditionally administered and taught, is demonstrated

by the increased use of challenging problems, projects, situations, the solution of which calls for all the knowledge, power and skill which the student may mobilize and command. Forms of vocational education which have immediacy as their end are not consistent with the liberal education program.

That it is not in contravention of what is usually known as progressive education, but is, on the other hand, in defense of it, is demonstrated by the shift in method now going on in our best unified colleges, in the direction of individualization both of the college itself and of the students enrolled.

That so many associations devoted to professional work are joining the Association of American Colleges in this development is a cause of great encouragement.

The student must have his windows open in every direction. The faculties must see that the students have an opportunity to see in every direction in this most unstable world any of us know anything about experientially. The college which is independent in management or is at the heart of the university stands for all that is stable. The college is steadying the boat in the face of threatened disaster. The college serves the purpose of ballast. There are times when security, equilibrium, sanity, are our greatest needs as a people and this seems to be one of those times.

This is not to say that the college is essentially conservative; it is not. That is merely one phase of the problem of the college. At the moment, it is emphasizing the conserving function, but it can do this more effectively because it is understood by everybody that on occasion it finds it quite consistent with its policy to turn loose a few bulls in the china shop.

The college believes in academic freedom along with this work of conservation. Sir Josiah Stamp, the Director of the Bank of England and Chairman of the London, Midland and Scottish Railway, made the remark a short time ago on this side of the Atlantic, "When the waters of the world are troubled, the gift of progress may be to shed oil upon them, or produce gyrostatic devices for equilibrium or craft which can make new records of smooth sailing, or a knowledge of weather lore and safe channels and a higher order of navigation. When the waters of the world are still and stagnant, green and dead, the gift of progress may be any stick which stirs them, any gas which aerates them, any

breeze or tempest which chases over them, any swift motive power which traverses them."

This is the twofold function of the American college as we understand it within the field of its obligation to society, and it is to this general principle that this twenty-second annual meeting of the Association is dedicated.

The Executive Secretary desires to put into the record a reference to the vast amount of unselfish work done during the year by the members of the Executive Committee, the staff members of the Association, the members of the Commissions and Committees, and the colleges themselves in our united and developing program.

A section of the public is still inclined to regard the undergraduate upon our campus as a playboy. With us this is rapidly becoming an outworn tradition. The average undergraduate is consciously, sometimes even too self-consciously, a young intellectual, a student and scholar. . . . If it is fair to say that the present generation of undergraduates is more serious than its predecessors, we must not forget that this increased interest in economic and political problems is occasionally bound to express itself in extravagant forms. Many institutions have taken steps to limit freedom of thought and discussion upon their campuses. We believe this is a serious mistake. We have always been of the opinion at Princeton that it is the business of the college to arouse the student to do his own thinking. . . . In a liberal college the only answer to an argument must remain a better and more convincing argument. Competent professors thoroughly versed in their subjects can be counted upon in free discussion to provide a far more effective check upon wild thinking than we can ever hope to do through illiberal methods of suppression and prohibition.—*Christian Gauss, Dean of the College, Princeton University.*

**THE REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICAN COLLEGES FOR THE YEAR ENDED
DECEMBER 31, 1935**

SCHEDULE "A"

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

JANUARY 1, 1935, TO DECEMBER 31, 1935

<i>Cash in Banks, January 1, 1935</i>	
West Side Savings Bank	\$ 3,250.59
Bowery Savings Bank	6,252.63
Bank of New York and Trust Co.	2,652.86
Total	12,156.08
 <i>Receipts</i>	
Dues	\$22,045.60
Bulletin	3,252.54
Books	580.20
Interest and Miscellaneous	291.48
	<hr/>
	26,169.82
	<hr/>
	38,325.90
 <i>Disbursements</i>	
Bulletin	3,817.41
Conferences, Committees and Commissions	2,836.83
Books	167.21
Christian Education Subscriptions	437.70
Office Salaries	13,328.77
Office Expenses	3,899.95
Subscriptions	302.50
	<hr/>
	24,790.37
	<hr/>
	13,535.53
 <i>College Music Study</i>	 2,641.96
	<hr/>
	\$10,893.57
	<hr/>
 <i>Balance, December 31, 1935</i>	
West Side Savings Bank	3,349.24
Bowery Savings Bank	6,442.46
Guaranty Trust Co.	1,062.89
Cash on Hand	38.98
	<hr/>
	\$10,893.57
	<hr/>

SCHEDULE "B"

CASH RECEIPTS

JANUARY 1, 1935 TO DECEMBER 31, 1935

Dues Collected		
For 1932	\$	27.00
1933		225.00
1934		1,057.50
1935		20,611.10
1936 In Advance		150.00
		<hr/>
		22,070.60
Less Refund of 1934 Dues		25.00
		<hr/>
Total Dues		\$22,045.60
Bulletin		
Regular, Reprints and Advertising		3,252.54
Books		
Comprehensive Examinations		
in Social Sciences		202.53
in American Colleges		207.98
College Instruction in Art		81.74
Architectural Planning of the American College		68.92
College Music		12.55
Miscellaneous		6.48
		<hr/>
Total Books	\$	580.20
Interest		
On Savings Accounts		288.48
On Arizona Draft		2.05
Miscellaneous95
		<hr/>
		291.48
		<hr/>
Total Receipts		<u>\$26,169.82</u>

SCHEDULE "C"

CASH DISBURSEMENTS

JANUARY 1, 1935 TO DECEMBER 31, 1935

Bulletin—Printing, Circulation, Reprints, etc.	\$	3,817.41
Conferences, Committees and Commissions		
Permanent Commissions	\$	1,024.42
Executive Committee		770.55
Annual Meeting		473.35
Federal Legislation		267.23
Regional Conferences		301.28
		<hr/>
		2,836.83
Books		167.21
Christian Education Subscriptions		437.70
Office Salaries		13,328.77
Office Expenses		
Rent		1,583.34
Telephone, Services, etc.		1,036.09
Equipment		165.68

The Activities of the Year

199

Travel	41.58	
R. L. Kelly, Insurance	80.00	
Moving and Furnishing	501.57	
Accounting and Custodian Charges	291.69	
		3,899.95
Subscriptions		
American Council on Education	100.00	
Tax Law Service	150.00	
Town Hall Club	52.50	
		302.50
Total Disbursements		\$24,790.37

SCHEDULE "D"

GENERAL STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AS OF

DECEMBER 31, 1935

Cash:		
Bowery Savings Bank	\$6,442.46	
West Side Savings Bank	3,349.24	
Guaranty Trust Company	1,062.89	
Cash on hand	38.98	
Total Cash	\$10,893.57	
Office Furniture and Equipment at estimated value of	1,401.93	
Total		\$12,295.50
General Fund	\$11,617.51	
College Music Fund	677.99	
		\$12,295.50

(No attempt has been made to evaluate the library, unsold books or subscriptions due but unpaid.)

Respectfully submitted,
LEROY E. KIMBALL, Treasurer

January 9, 1936

We hereby certify that the foregoing statements of Cash Receipts and Cash Disbursements of the Association of American Colleges for the year ended December 31, 1935, are, in our opinion, correct and in agreement with the books and bank accounts.

We take this opportunity of expressing our appreciation to the members of your staff who accorded us their hearty cooperation, and wish to compliment your bookkeeper on the neatness and accuracy of her records.

Respectfully,

(Signed) TAIT, WELLER & BAKER,
By EMILIE Z. BAKER
Certified Public Accountant

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEARS 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935 AS COMPARED WITH 1936 BUDGET

General Business Account

INCOME

	1932	1933	1934	1935	BUDGET 1936
Membership Dues	\$21,655.00	\$21,177.54	\$23,624.96	\$22,045.60	\$22,000.00
BULLETIN (including Reprints) <i>The Effective College</i>	2,616.60	1,910.93	2,775.69	3,252.54	3,200.00
Comprehensive Examinations Projects	186.31	135.69	43.94		
College Music Study Refund	456.69	484.09	610.51	410.51	200.00
College Music and Other Art Books	792.13				
College Surveys	1,206.74	1	1	169.69	500.00
Refund, C. C. B. E. Joint Office Account	271.34				
Miscellaneous Interest on bank balances, etc.	110.45	683.01	280.11	291.48	250.00
Other		40.41	19.26		200.00
Total Income	\$27,295.26	\$24,431.67	\$27,354.47	\$26,169.82	\$26,350.00

EXPENDITURES

	1932	1933	1934	1935	BUDGET 1936
Annual Meeting	\$ 424.04	\$ 292.02	\$ 397.23	\$ 473.35	\$ 500.00 ²
American Council on Education Annual Dues	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Executive Committee Expenses Permanent Commissions	646.09	640.96	846.10	770.55	850.00
	599.91	558.48	269.37	1,024.42	1,000.00

¹ Reported in special Art Booklets Account: \$205.71 (1933); \$193.95 (1934).

² On February 18, 1936, the Executive Committee voted an additional \$500.00 for Annual Meeting Expenses.

* On February 18, 1936, the Executive Committee voted an additional \$500.00 for Annual Meeting Expenses.

	EXPENDITURES				
BULLETIN (including Reprints)	3,061.47	1,998.66	2,685.03	3,817.41	3,500.00
Christian Education Subscriptions	458.00	470.00	459.20	437.70	400.00
The Effective College	37.66	22.00			
Comprehensive Exams. in the					
Social Sciences			419.10		
College Surveys	1,055.75	191.40		267.23	900.00
Government Relationships			373.11	301.28	300.00
Regional Conferences		*	62.07	167.21	50.00
Handling of Books				291.69	
Accounting	572.54	424.82	548.32		
Headquarters Office					
Rent	\$ 2,625.48	\$ 1,441.73	\$ 1,200.04	\$ 1,583.34	\$ 2,000.00
Office Expenses	794.79	864.36	768.06	1,036.09	900.00
Office Equipment	17.12	20.50	29.18	165.68	
Travel (net)	47.49	261.94	186.56	241.58	250.00
R. L. Kelly Insurance	480.00	480.00	480.00	80.00	
Salaries	15,897.00	14,976.23	12,906.10	13,328.77	14,000.00
Miscellaneous	3.78				200.00
		18,044.76	15,567.94	16,435.46	17,350.00
Contingent					
Moving and Furnishing	80.00	143.28	85.00	501.57	
Tax Law Service				150.00	
Town Hall Club				52.50	
Total Disbursements	\$26,901.12	\$22,886.38	\$21,812.47	\$24,790.37	\$24,950.00
Balance on Current	\$ 394.14	\$ 1,545.29	\$ 5,542.00	\$ 1,379.45	\$ 1,400.00
Operations					

* No budget appropriation in 1933 but \$119.34 for S. W. Regional Conference was included in Contingent.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE FOR 1935-36

JAMES L. McCONAUGHY, *Chairman*
PRESIDENT OF WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION :

1. THE Commission reports that two meetings were held during 1935, with representatives of the American Association of University Professors, including the President, the General Secretary, and the Legal Adviser of Committee A. These conferences, particularly that held in New York in November, proved unusually helpful. The Commission will meet with representatives of the AAUP in New York, this week. We consider such joint conferences one of the most worth while efforts of our Commission.

2. In January, 1935, the Commission asked the officers of the AAUP to consult with them when any case involving a member of the faculty arose in a college which was a member of our Association. Six such cases developed during 1935; in four of them, possibly due partially to the interest of our Commission, no investigation or report was finally made; reports on two cases appeared in recent *Bulletins* of the AAUP.

3. This plan of cordial cooperation between the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors will be continued this year. All contact between the two organizations will be through our Executive Secretary. The members of our Commission will receive copies of all letters, and will communicate with the Chairman, who will then present the attitude of our Commission on any case that may arise.

4. Last year we urged the representatives of the AAUP to recognize the position of colleges in their organization; we regretted the absence of the word "college" from their name. We are interested to note that the membership of the Council of the AAUP for 1936 includes at least seven *college* teachers; for 1935, there were three, only one of whom was a man. We also suggested that the AAUP, whenever possible, appoint at least one *college* teacher on the investigating committee to visit a college when a case arises under Committee A.

5. Our experience this year with matters of academic tenure leads us again to urge our members to make perfectly clear the basis of appointment of members of their faculty; most cases are due to differences in understanding of verbal appointments. We call attention to the fact that there have appeared in our *Bulletin* the regulations covering appointments at certain colleges (*Bulletin*, March, 1935, page 179; *Bulletin*, May, 1935, page 380). The regulations recently adopted by DePauw seem to us admirable; it is understood that they have been heartily approved by the officers of the AAUP. They are as follows:

Section I gives the general salary scale; Section II describes the determination of faculty salaries when the institution's income is curtailed; Section III, on academic freedom and tenure, restates the resolutions adopted by this Association in January, 1925, and quoted in this Commission's Report last year. This section concludes as follows:

In accordance with these principles, it is recommended that contracts for the instructor, assistant professor and associate professor ranks shall be for one year. Unless such contracts are renewed by the University, the services of the teacher shall be considered discontinued upon the expiration of the contract. Notices shall be sent to members of the faculty on February fifteenth, covering contract for the following academic year; namely, from September first of that year to August thirty-first of the succeeding year. All contracts for the professor rank shall be of indefinite tenure.

Terms of tenure in initial contracts with the University shall be determined by the Board of Trustees and Visitors upon recommendation of the President.

Termination of service for cause shall require the concurrence of a committee composed of the departmental head, the Dean of the College and the President of the University. The departmental head shall be the head of the department in which the professor serves. A professor who objects to the decision of this committee shall have the right to appeal his case to the Committee on Instruction and Equipment of the Board of Trustees and Visitors.

In the event that economic conditions or changes in educational policy require reduction of course offerings, or discontinuance of departments, the teachers involved shall be given honorable release after notice of one year.

Section IV outlines the faculty retirement plan.

6. We believe a large majority of the difficulties connected with academic tenure will be obviated if: (a) the details of the appointment are recorded in writing; (b) any verbal conferences are summarized in writing, each party having a copy of the summary; (c) early notice is given when service to an institution is to terminate; (d) a hearing is provided for faculty members, if they wish it.

7. We suggest that when presidents without previous administrative experience are appointed to colleges in our membership, the Executive Committee of our Association be asked to consider transmitting to the appointee information about our Commission, and copies of tenure and appointment regulations which may be of help to him.

8. We are convinced that the AAUP desires to cooperate fully in improving the quality of the teaching profession. As was stated in the report of our Commission a year ago, we believe that they are not anxious to protect the unfit, lazy, or incompetent. We hope that when such teachers are found on college faculties, their service will be terminated after due notice, and we think that in such cases the officers of the AAUP will fully support the action. This is definitely expressed in the October AAUP *Bulletin*, pp. 460-461 and pp. 482-486.

9. We believe full recognition should be given to the differences in institutions; what is acceptable on some campuses is not suitable elsewhere. A college should not be condemned because, due to peculiar circumstances, it cannot permit practices and utterances which might reasonably be expected on other campuses.

10. We join with the officers of the AAUP in urging peculiar thoughtfulness regarding academic freedom, in the immediate future. We believe that this is a period of unusual strain and stress in America. We urge our colleagues to support freedom of speech with all the vigor and wisdom they possess. We likewise urge college teachers to do their part fully to avoid utterances which will result in condemnation of the colleges they serve. We are impressed with the saneness of this advice to college teachers: "Before making a public statement on a controversial question, let us ask ourselves first, Is what I am about to say, true? Second, will any good be accomplished by saying it?"

We strongly urge that incompetents should not be kept upon our faculties because administrators fear that they will plead "the right of free speech." While upon the question of incompetence or lack of good sense the burden of proof properly rests upon the college administration making the charge, on the issue of interference with academic freedom the burden of proof rests upon the instructor who alleges such interference; this burden can be discharged only by producing evidence such as would convince reasonable men as regards other business matters. It is not discharged, for example, by involving consciously or unconsciously the presumption that when the services of an instructor whose views on public or educational questions differ from those of the president of the institution, are discontinued, the difference of viewpoint is the cause of the discontinuance. The indulgence of any such presumption is calculated to protect the incompetent, and such a presumption is now protecting various instructors in various institutions who hold so-called "liberal" views who if they had orthodox views would be eliminated for inefficiency or because they are all-round misfits.

Since this report was prepared, the Commission A of the AAUP has reported at the St. Louis meeting in Christmas week, and I think you may be interested to know two or three items that appeared in that report of the AAUP Commission.

In the first place, the total number of cases last year was sixty-nine, fewer than the average for earlier years, and if any of you feel that the AAUP Commission A is spending all of its time condemning colleges, may I remind you that of those cases, eighteen were withdrawn, twenty-six were rejected, fourteen were visited; in other words, a very small minority of the cases called to the attention of Committee A actually is investigated.

I would also call attention to the fact that this report of Committee A comments upon the relationships with our Association, the meetings with our Commission, and urges that there be a recognition of the place of the college, representation of college faculties in their organization, and a representative of a college in any investigating committee.

THE SURVEY OF THE COLLEGE FACULTIES
A REPORT FOR THE COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND
TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

B. W. KUNKEL, Director
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE

THE SURVEY of the college faculties which is sponsored by the Commission on the Enlistment and Training of College Teachers of this Association was undertaken at a time when it seemed to the surveyor as if the results could be summarized very easily, as if it would be possible to draw conclusions which would have marked significance in the enlistment and training of college teachers. The analysis of the replies to the questionnaires which were sent out nearly a year ago has proved far more involved than was expected and the statistics require more exhaustive analysis than that to which they have been subjected up to this time if they are not to be positively misleading. The fundamental question, which it was hoped to answer, was whether the younger men in the profession differ from the older in regard to their family backgrounds, geographical backgrounds, and educational backgrounds. College administrators want to think that every appointment is an improvement on the earlier incumbent. But there has been a very rapid increase in the size of college and university faculties, especially since the war, and from letters written by applicants for positions which have come to my attention recently, I began to wonder whether the recruits for the profession were as well educated as the older generation of teachers. I am not in a position to answer this question positively at present but beg to report progress in the examination of the voluminous data on hand and the hope that in a little time it may be possible for us to say that objectively the profession is either improving or deteriorating or standing still.

Of fundamental importance in any statistical study is the adequacy of the sample upon which the study is based. Replies have been received from 42.8 per cent of the members of the American Association of University Professors. Geographically the sample is well distributed. The smallest percentage of

replies has come from the District of Columbia and Oklahoma (29 per cent) and Hawaii (17 per cent), and the greatest response has been from Wyoming, (78 per cent), and Nevada, (71 per cent). Twenty-four states replied to the extent of 40-50 per cent. The sample also seems to be adequate in regard to the departments of instruction represented. The teachers of education may be represented a little more frequently than their number warrants but no careful calculation has been made to determine the number of teachers in the various departments of instruction in the colleges of the country.

The preliminary report published in the December BULLETIN of the Association gives a general summary of the results obtained to date with no attempt to differentiate between the different age groups of college faculties.

In order to compare the older and the younger men of the profession, the sample has been divided into approximately three equal groups, the old, middle, and young groups with birth years respectively, up to and including 1884, 1885 to 1894 inclusive, and 1895 and later.

Thirteen and three-tenths per cent of those replying to the questionnaires are women, divided in the age groups as follows: old group 11.4 per cent, middle group 15.4 per cent, and young group 11.9 per cent. How reliable these figures are statistically has not been determined. The small percentage in the last group may be explained by a possible tendency on the part of the younger men to join organizations earlier than their sisters.

Of 4718 replying in regard to the number of children, there are 5952 living children. In the old group there are 1.61 children per teacher, in the middle group 1.42, and in the young group 0.83. Since, however, the families of the middle and young groups are probably not complete, the figures as they stand need to be corrected. There are 900 married couples in the group reporting no children, 949 with a single child, 1062 with two children, 519 with three, 201 with four, sixty-one with five, seventeen with six and fifteen with over six, and one of these is in the young group.

The stability of the married state seems to be unusually high among college faculties for there are only fifty-one divorces and separations reported.

Three hundred and ninety of those replying were born beyond the confines of the United States, divided according to the age groups as follows: 10.8 per cent of the old group, 7.5 per cent of the middle group, and 7.1 per cent of the young group. The most important foreign countries furnishing teachers have been Canada, Germany, Great Britain, Asia (including a number of children of missionaries), and Russia.

The separate states which have produced the largest number of college teachers are New York, 418; Ohio, 360; Pennsylvania, 359; Illinois, 299; Massachusetts, 293; Indiana, 232; and Iowa, 208. These seven states have furnished almost half of those replying. On the basis of the population of these states in 1890, which is close to the median year of birth of the college faculties, we find these states produced 86.5 teachers per million of population as contrasted with 74 for the entire country. Of the old group, the New England states produced 60.7 per million of population; of the middle group, 34.3; and of the young group, 28.6.

The nativity of the teachers in the three age groups may be compared on the basis of the percentage of those born in each section belonging to each age group. Forty-three per cent of those born in New England are in the old group, 29 per cent in the middle group and 28 per cent in the young group. Twenty-eight per cent of those born in the Middle Atlantic States are of the old group, 31 per cent of the middle group and 41 per cent in the young group. Of those born in the Southern States north of South Carolina, 31 per cent are in the old group, 33 per cent in the middle group and 36 per cent in the young group. In the extreme South 28 per cent belong to the old group, 28 per cent to the middle group, and 44 per cent to the young group. Of the teachers born in the Mississippi Valley almost exactly one-third belong to each age group; while in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States the distribution is almost exactly the same as in the extreme South. Of the foreign born, 42 per cent are in the old group, 28 per cent in the middle group and 30 per cent in the young group.

The number of college teachers born in the larger cities indicates that the environment of the city is not quite as productive of teachers as the rest of the country. Thirty-two of the largest

cities having a population of at least 100,000 in 1890 produced 622 of the teachers, or 61 per million. The rest of the country, however, produced teachers at the rate of 69 per million of population. Apparently the large cities are not producing as many teachers today as they did earlier for if we limit the metropolitan areas to the six which were over 500,000 in 1900 we find that the three age groups are quite differently represented, the ratios being 22.2, 17.5, and 17.0 per million for the old, middle and young groups respectively.

The academic degrees earned by the three groups may serve as a rough measure of the extent of the formal education of each of the age groups. Two and eight-tenths per cent of the teachers in the old group did not have the equivalent of the bachelor's degree; 1.3 per cent in the middle group lacked the degree and in the young group 1.4 per cent. In the old group 6.9 per cent have only the bachelor's degree, while in the middle and young groups the percentage is 3.2 and 3.8 per cent respectively. The percentage of each age group holding the doctor's degree is 67.2, 72.7, and 66.7 respectively.

Of especial interest to administrators may be the figures which show how the several colleges have contributed to the profession, for certainly one very important purpose of the institution of higher learning is to provide successors to the teaching staffs. Graduates from 479 different colleges in the United States and Canada are represented. Exactly fifty are represented by twenty or more graduates among the ranks of the teachers. These fifty furnish 2,483 teachers. Harvard, Michigan, Chicago, Cornell, Wisconsin, Yale, Indiana, Columbia, and Princeton, in descending order, have at least seventy-five representatives.

An examination of the ages at which the bachelor's degree is obtained shows that 102 were at least thirty-four years old. That is, 3.4 per cent were about twelve years older than the general average of college graduates. Limiting the members of the old group to those who graduated before they were thirty-four years so that they could be compared more justly with the young group, the average age at graduation of the old group is $24.18 \pm .05$ and of the young group $22.50 \pm .03$, a difference which is significant from the mathematical point of view.

The age at which the doctor's degree is obtained shows a marked variation. The youngest doctorate was obtained at age twenty in 1893; the oldest was obtained at age sixty in 1921, another at fifty-nine in 1929. Eleven per cent obtained their doctorate at forty or later. Comparing the three age groups with respect to the length of time taken to obtain the doctorate we find the young group took 3.6 years, the middle group 7.1, and the old group 10.1 years. Disregarding all those who obtained the doctorate beyond the age of thirty-four so that the groups may be more nearly comparable, the interval between the two degrees becomes 3.4, 7.1, and 5.4 respectively.

The average age at which the full professorship is attained is 36.66 years; that is 12.8 years after graduation from college.

The occupational status of the fathers of the college teachers has not been analyzed further than is indicated in the preliminary report already published.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS

CHARLES J. TURCK, *Chairman*
PRESIDENT OF CENTRE COLLEGE

THE Committee on the Enrolment of Students reports that from the information in possession of its members we judge that there has been a distinct improvement in the methods employed by colleges in approaching prospective students. Primarily this is due to the general improvement in the financial situation, as colleges find themselves relieved from the extreme pressure of depression days. We hope that a contributing cause of the improvement has been the direction of public attention to the serious consequences that would follow the wholesale granting of aid to all types of students by institutions, many of which are financially unable to carry an excessive student-aid load.

Your Committee submits the following general principles for the administrators and field representatives of colleges to observe in their dealings with prospective students, and we believe that these principles control the conduct of nearly all educators in this field:

(1) The interest of the individual student must be the primary concern of the interviewer.

(2) The opportunities of the college must be presented with exact honesty and truth. Exaggeration is not truth.

(3) References to other colleges should be omitted. Indirect slurs are as harmful as direct slanders.

(4) Aid offered to the student should be in proportion to his need and to the ability of the college to pay for the aid. Benevolent grants, beyond the ability of the college to sustain, will impoverish the faculty and in the end bankrupt the institution.

Your Committee would direct the attention of officers in charge of the enrolment of students to the fact that higher standards in college necessarily presume greater care in the selection of students. Consequently, the effective college must develop new techniques for the wise and appropriate presentation of the college to prospective students. Instead of competing with the weakest institution in a group, each college should develop methods that will draw to itself the type of students for whom the college is best suited. Cooperative efforts along this line by groups of institutions are practicable and valuable. We commend particularly the constructive work being done by the Committee on College Entrance of the Ohio College Association, by the Midwest College Conference, and by other state groups. We believe that agreements as to a uniform tuition charge by colleges of the same type within a given area will go further than any other remedy in curing excessive competition, whenever such competition may exist. There should be the frankest and fullest exchange of information by all colleges within the cooperating group. The gradual development of a spirit of cooperation, of the sense that the colleges are serving a large prospective student group, not as rivals but as partners, is the slow but certain way to eliminate such abuses as may have crept into the current practices in the field of student enrolment.

We take this occasion to warn most emphatically of the financial dangers to any college or group of colleges that makes excessive use of scholarships or other forms of financial aid to attract students. In such institutions, those who are able to pay the full rate feel that they are the victims of a system that grants rebates recklessly, and they quickly learn to demand financial reductions

which they do not need. The result is destructive of any system of fair tuition rates, and can end only in the practical bankruptcy of the offending institutions.

Your Committee would prefer to leave the matter with this general statement of principles, except for the recent wide-spread discussion of proposals to pay athletes, which if carried out would mean recruiting of this type of student on a scale more expensive and dangerous than anything we have yet had in the educational world. We therefore repeat as a part of this report two paragraphs from the report of last year, written before any proposals of pay for athletes were agitated:

In regard to the recruiting of athletes, we take this occasion to reaffirm the historic position of American educators, that students who are athletes should receive no more and no less consideration than any other group of students. All students should be treated exactly alike as regards scholarships, grants-in-aid, loans and jobs. We believe that this historic attitude is sound, and that athletes themselves would benefit greatly if all institutions would receive and treat them exactly as all other students.

We recognize that this statement is an ideal rather than a reality. We have no desire to affix the blame for the present deplorable situation in the recruiting of athletes and their subsidization, nor do we intend to go on a muck-raking expedition to discover individual offenders against the ideal we have announced. We appeal to presidents, faculty members, coaches, athletic directors, students and alumni, to observe in letter and in spirit the lofty standards of college sport, and to resist, no matter what the pressure, the temptation to professionalize college football and other sports. We admit our inability thus far to control the situation, but we refuse to haul down our banner.

In conclusion, your Committee would report that the general matter of methods used in the enrolment of students has been called to the attention of the various state and regional associations. Your Committee believes that these bodies are the ones best equipped to make studies and investigations, to outline approved procedures for enrolling students, and in the few cases where unethical methods are used in securing students, to exercise the appropriate disciplinary authority. The Association of American Colleges is not equipped to do more than observe the

major trends in this matter and submit such general suggestions as may seem wise. We gladly note the improvement of the past year, we re-emphasize the importance of observing the highest ethical standards in our approaches to students, and we urge the continued study of this matter by the state and regional groups.

This report calls for no formal action. I move that it be received and filed.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE PERSONNEL

A. C. HANFORD, *Chairman*
DEAN OF HARVARD COLLEGE

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE PERSONNEL is prepared to make only a tentative report of progress at this time. The problems of training for the public service and the question as to the part which the traditional American college of liberal arts and sciences should play in any program for the improvement of the government service are so broad and complicated that they require a much more complete study than the Committee has been able to make in the time that has elapsed since its appointment. It is contemplated that a more complete report will be published in one of the BULLETINS during the current year.

The increased activities of government and the importance of public administration in this country make it essential that more attention be paid to the improvement of federal, state, and local government personnel. More specifically there should be developed a career service which would attract to the government the best available man power, including a fair proportion of the most capable and promising young men and women who graduate each year from our colleges and universities. Although the American people spend more money upon education than any other country and give more consideration to the problems of school and college, we pay less attention to these matters than any other nation in the selection of persons for administrative positions. "We believe that education is worth great sacrifice, but in the public service we act as if it were of so little significance

that those who have, and those who have not, an education are virtually on a par." (*Better Government Personnel*,¹ p. 79.) This feeling is deep seated in spite of the fact that our system of higher education has been established on a thoroughly democratic basis with opportunities for university training accessible to the youth of the land regardless of the circumstances of birth, family, or wealth.

One of the pressing needs of the times, therefore, is the development of public opinion which will change the traditional attitude of the American people so far as the administrative and professional services of our various levels of government are concerned and which will pave the way for the establishment of a *career service* in the administrative departments of our national, state, and local governments. Such a service may be defined briefly as "an honorable occupation which one normally takes up in youth with the expectation of advancement, and pursues until retirement." Although considerable progress has been made in this direction in the Foreign Service of the United States, in the technical and scientific branches of the national government (such as the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Standards, and Public Health Service), and in certain other departments and units of government throughout the country, the public service is at present far from attractive to the best type of young men and women who are graduating from our colleges and universities.

A thorough analysis of the conditions and problems of the American civil service and recommendations for the reorganization of the entire government service on a career basis have been made available during the past year through the activities of the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, which has published its general findings in a report entitled *Better Government Personnel*.¹ This Commission was appointed late in 1933 by the Social Service Research Council, and its work, which was carried on over a period of a year, was financed by a grant from the Spelman Fund. The members of the Commission were Dr. L. D. Coffman, President of the University of Minnesota, as Chairman; Mr. Louis Brownlow, Director of the Public Administration Clearing House, Chicago; Mr. Ralph Budd, President of

¹ New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1935, pp. X, 182.

the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad; Mr. Arthur L. Day, Vice-President of the Corning Glass Works; Dr. Charles E. Merriam, Chairman of the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago; and Dr. Luther Gulick, Director of the Institute of Public Administration and Eaton Professor of Municipal Science and Administration at Columbia University, who was selected as secretary of the Commission and director of research. The mere mention of the names of the members of the Commission is sufficient to indicate the quality of its work and the soundness of its findings. The Commission held hearings in various parts of the country and in Ottawa and London, at which government officials, business men, and educational leaders presented evidence as to existing practices and offered suggestions for improvement. Secondly, a competent research staff was appointed to gather important data for the Commission. In the third place, qualified authorities were engaged to prepare monographs on the operation of the British, French, and German civil service, on the training of public employees in this country and abroad, on the problems of the American public service, and on related topics. The general report of the Commission has, therefore, been supplemented by the publication of a half-dozen volumes dealing in a comprehensive manner with the question of developing a career service in this country.² Throughout the series, attention is paid to the part which college and university training should play in the evolution of such a program. College officials and teachers interested in the improvement of the public service and in the problems of training for such work will find the report of the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel and the various supporting and supplementary volumes of invaluable assistance. Your Committee endorses the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel and wishes to stress the importance of a careful study and con-

² *A Bibliography of Civil Service and Personnel Administration* by Sarah Greer; *Civil Service Abroad: Great Britain, Canada, France, Germany* by Leonard D. White, Charles H. Bland, Walter R. Sharp, and Fritz M. Marx; *Problems of the American Public Service* by Carl J. Friedrich, William C. Beyer and others; and *Government by Merit: An Analysis of the Problems of Government Personnel* by Lucius Wilmerding, Jr. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1935).

sideration of the Report of the Commission by all members of the Association of American Colleges.

The report of the Commission of Inquiry has been regarded by leading authorities as "one of the landmarks in the history of American thought about government." It has already had an important influence in stimulating consideration of the subject of training for the public service by numerous university committees and conferences. As a result, there is now available a large body of data and of opinions on the matter, a summary of which is contained in the report of a conference held at Princeton in June, 1935, which has been published by the Public Administration Service under the title of "Training for the Public Service."³ In this report special attention is given to such matters as academic preparation for the public service, including undergraduate preparation and also graduate and professional training. It was the opinion of the conference that "except for the general concepts of training for citizenship, the undergraduate aspects seem to require no particular attention to the problems of preparation specifically for the public service." Your Committee agrees with the conclusion reached at the Princeton conference that it is unwise to establish special courses for undergraduates devoted *primarily* to the public service. Undergraduate work leading to the A.B. degree or the liberal B.S. degree should not be of a vocational or professional nature but should stress broad cultural preparation. Also, as stated in the conference report, special courses for undergraduates "labelled as preparatory to public service may be misleading to students who by attendance may expect special consideration for public appointment." Specialized training for the public service should be a matter primarily for the graduate and professional schools of our universities.

Although it does not seem desirable to provide special courses in the liberal college intended chiefly as preparation for entrance into the public service, we should not overlook the importance of undergraduate instruction in the social sciences which will give students a thorough understanding of the history, traditions, and workings of our governmental system. As a result of such

³ Edited by Morris B. Lambie for the Public Administration Clearing House, 850 East 58th St., Chicago, 1935, p. 49.

courses, the undergraduate who subsequently becomes an active citizen also becomes a somewhat more intelligent critic of such matters as government budgets and administration. Whatever is done in college toward teaching the essentials of efficient government personnel work ought to make a contribution to the content of good citizenship.

It is significant that the United States Civil Service Commission has within the last two years recognized the place of a general form of education as distinguished from professional or specialized training as preparation for entrance to certain positions in the administrative service. In 1934 there was established an examination for "Junior Civil Service Examiners," the only prerequisite for which is an A.B. or S.B. degree without specification of any detailed kind of concentration in college. The purpose of this examination was to build up an eligible list of young men and women who had just graduated from liberal colleges as possible appointees to the administrative service. As stated by the Princeton conference, the examination "is devised to test native ability, capacity and intelligence, and not knowledge of specific subject matter. . . . The example of the United States Civil Service Commission in accepting the principle in recruiting for the Junior Civil Service Examiner group is a most significant step toward the development of a non-professional administrative class within the Federal service." The Civil Service Commission plans to build up another eligible list by offering a similar examination during the present year. The efforts of the United States Civil Service Commission in this direction deserve the hearty support and encouragement of members of the Association of American Colleges and of all persons interested in the development of a career service in American government.

In conclusion, the greatest assistance which we can render as individuals at this time is in the promotion of an intelligent public interest and the creation of better standards in the government service. The chief purpose of this tentative report is to keep alive in the minds of the members of the Association of American Colleges the vital need in these times for an improved public personnel and for the development of a career service in our various units of government.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES

JOHN C. CHRISTENSEN, *Chairman*
CONTROLLER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE Committee on Insurance and Annuities has the honor of presenting its first annual report. This Committee was appointed during the past year and has carried on some preliminary investigations with the view of outlining a policy to be followed in its deliberations. It seems to the Committee that its primary objects should be (a) to study questions which arise from time to time which may affect the insurance and annuity policies of colleges and universities; (b) to report the results of such investigations, with recommendations, to the membership of the Association of American Colleges through annual reports or otherwise; and (c) to stimulate publicity in regard to the importance of insurance and retirement plans to educational institutions.

In this report the Committee calls attention to the following matters:

1. The passage of the Federal Social Security Act has brought into new and sharp relief the desirability of old age retirement plans, particularly because the Act as now written exempts religious, charitable, scientific, or educational institutions. This exemption, however, does not preclude the inclusion of this class of organizations in state legislation. If educational institutions are to be exempt, the membership of the Association should watch carefully any legislation proposed in the several states, or an institution may find itself in the position of being taxed to support state pension systems. For example, the District of Columbia makes no exemptions and institutions located therein are subject to the tax.

2. In view of national and state provisions for old age pensions, your Committee thinks that educational institutions should establish as soon and as fully as possible retirement plans for all members of the faculty. If means are not available to cover the entire group, a beginning may be made with the members who have attained professorial rank, the others being included as rapidly as conditions permit.

3. It seems to your Committee that there should be greater publicity in advocating insurance and retirement plans to colleges and universities. Bulletins, even smaller and more concise than the bulletin entitled "Planning a Retirement System," recently published by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, might be issued at suitable intervals to keep both institutions and individuals informed and stimulated to action. Considerable use also might be made of graphs to illustrate the advantage of taking annuity policies early in life. Your Committee hopes to assist in the preparation of material of this kind for general distribution.

4. If institutions are unable to finance a contributory pension plan, members of the staff should be urged by administrative officers and boards of trustees to take out annuity policies as early in life as possible with the view of providing for income during the retirement period. Heads of departments also might well counsel their younger colleagues to begin with small policies if they cannot afford policies in amounts considered adequate.

5. Institutions can profitably assist in this publicity to individual members of the staff for the reason that all educators undoubtedly are agreed that an adequate pension will assist an institution in building up and retaining an efficient staff.

6. Since the faculties of some institutions are too small to make group insurance advantageous and the experience of colleges which have tried group insurance is not uniformly favorable, your committee believes that available funds should first be applied to annuity policies. Insurance then would be a personal matter until such time as the institutions could aid in the purchase of some form of insurance. Meanwhile, administrators should urge upon all members of the faculty the wisdom of carrying as much insurance as possible.

7. Your Committee thinks that special attention should be called to the Annual Reports of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, because this Association not only has teacher-policyholders in practically all American colleges but is the agency through which about 90 per cent of the colleges that have adopted formal contributory retirement plans administer those plans. Special interest for members of our Association therefore attaches to the record of the affairs of the Teachers

Insurance and Annuity Association presented in its Annual Reports, and to the discussions and recommendations regarding insurance and annuity problems contained in those reports and in other of its publications. We are authorized to say that this Association will gladly assist institutions and individuals with either insurance or annuity problems.

Your Committee hopes to report either in annual statements or through the BULLETIN of the Association of American Colleges any significant developments touching the foregoing problems as they affect American colleges and universities.

THE BULLETIN IN 1936

The BULLETIN in 1936 will present reports of progress in the several fields represented in this issue, in curriculum developments, in the new projects described on page 5, and in personnel work, with special reference to guidance of student initiative, formulation of objectives including citizenship, uses of leisure, adaptability to changing opportunities in various occupations, etc., etc.

I ENCLOSE check for the BULLETIN and wish to say how very greatly I enjoy reading it. The last number was a real gem.—*A College President.*

THE LAST BULLETIN is a genuine Christmas gift for all of us. I am amazed at the quantity and quality of its contents.—*A Personnel Director.*

I HAVE subscribed to the BULLETIN personally for several years and have found it very helpful and am sure those whose addresses are enclosed will be greatly interested in it.—*A College President (new member).*

RECENT issues have been *particularly helpful*. Congratulations! I shall be glad to bring the opportunity for club membership to as many of our faculty as possible. I should think everyone would want to receive your valuable journal at this greatly reduced rate.—*A Dean of Men.*

FOR distribution to Science and Literature Faculty Members to afford them an opportunity to keep abreast of the main currents of thought in college education.—*Comment on Club Order for 32 Subscriptions.*

See further announcement and order blank on the back cover of this issue.

**MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES**

**JANUARY 16 AND 17, 1936
THE ROOSEVELT, NEW YORK, NEW YORK**

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16

Morning Session

THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING of the Association of American Colleges convened in The Roosevelt, New York City, at 10:10 o'clock, Thursday morning, January 16, 1936, President Henry M. Wriston, President of the Association, presiding.

The following Committees were announced by President Wriston:

Committee on Nominations: President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, *Chairman*; President Thurston J. Davies, Colorado College, President William F. Tolley, Allegheny College, President Harry M. Gage, Coe College.

Committee on Resolutions: President Walter L. Lingle, Davidson College, *Chairman*; President Aurelia H. Reinhardt, Mills College, President C. S. Boucher, West Virginia University.

Record of official action taken by the Association will be found on pages 222-227.

The following program for the meeting was carried out:

PROGRAM

Welcome to New York

Herbert E. Hawkes, Dean, Columbia College

The Annual Report

Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary

The Report of the Treasurer

LeRoy E. Kimball, Comptroller, New York University

Reports of Commissions and Committees

Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure

James L. McConaughy, President, Wesleyan University,
Chairman

Enlistment and Training of College TeachersAlbert Britt, President, Knox College, *Chairman*

Beverly W. Kunkel, Lafayette College

Enrolment of StudentsCharles J. Turck, President, Centre College, *Chairman***Insurance and Annuities**John C. Christensen, Controller, University of Michigan,
*Chairman***Public Service Personnel**A. Chester Hanford, Dean, Harvard College, *Chairman***The Integrity of the American College—From the Standpoint of Administration**Walter A. Jessup, President, The Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

It was

Voted, Unanimously, to approve the recommendations of the Executive Committee, submitted by the Executive Secretary and the Treasurer, as follows:

(1) That the following Commissions and Committees be temporarily suspended: the Commission on Educational Surveys, the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds, the Committee on the Enrolment of Students, and the Committee on Federal Legislation.

(2) That the By-Laws of the Association be revised by omitting Section 1, which reads:

In order to be eligible to membership in this Association institutions shall require fifteen units for admission to the freshman class and 120 semester hours, or an equivalent, for graduation.

making Section 2 the first section, and renumbering the remaining six By-Laws accordingly. (This recommendation was presented at the General Session on Thursday morning, but adopted on Friday morning to conform to By-Law 7.)

(3) That the Association provide an annual subscription for 1936 to the magazine, *Christian Education*, to the member colleges that request it in writing.

(4) That the following institutions be admitted to membership in the Association:

Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
Berry College, Mount Berry, Ga.
College Misericordia, Dallas, Pa.
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa.
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs, N. C.
Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo.
Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.
Kentucky State Industrial College, Frankfort, Ky.
Marshall College, Huntington, West Va.
Mt. Mercy College, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison, Kans.
*St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J.
Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.
Texas College, Tyler, Tex.
University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

(5) That the Report of the Treasurer be adopted and that the budget presented in the Treasurer's Report be made the official budget of the Association for the year 1936, subject to modification by the Executive Committee as need may arise.

Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education, by invitation, spoke briefly concerning plans for bringing foreign savants to the colleges.

Dr. Otis W. Caldwell, representing the AAUP, Mr. Thomas F. Neblett, President of the NSF, and Miss Dze-djen Li, representing Ginling College, Nanking, China, were introduced as fraternal delegates.

Afternoon Session

Section "A"—COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN THE ARTS

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, Presiding
Randall Thompson, Composer and Author of *College Music*
(In the absence of Dr. Thompson, his prepared paper was read by President Ferry)

Arthur Pope, Department of Art, Harvard University
Roberta M. Fansler, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
Francis H. Taylor, The Worcester Art Museum

Section "B"—THE LIBERAL COLLEGE IN THE TAX-SUPPORTED UNIVERSITY

President Frederick B. Robinson, College of the City of New York, Presiding

* Vote taken Friday morning, January 17th.

**The Formulation of Aims that Meet Individual Needs and
Are Adjusted to Current Life Applications**

President Robinson

President Raymond Walters, The University of Cincinnati

**Are There Aims that Are Peculiar to the Tax-Supported
College?**

Dean Lloyd C. Emmons, Michigan State College

Dean A. W. Hobbs, University of North Carolina

**Can Proper Aims be Attained Without Selective Admis-
sions? Is Selective Admission Practicable in Tax-Sup-
ported Colleges?**

President Shelton J. Phelps, Winthrop College

Dean M. R. McClure, University of Illinois

Section "C"—MORE RECENT COLLEGE PLANS

President George B. Cutten, Colgate University, Presiding

The Colgate Plan

President Cutten

Southwestern's Tutorial Plan

President Charles E. Diehl, SOUTHWESTERN (Memphis)

The Bard Program

Treasurer Frederic H. Kent, Bard College

The Skidmore Plan

President Henry T. Moore, Skidmore College

The Hiram Plan

President Kenneth L. Brown, Hiram College

The General College

President John J. Tigert, University of Florida

Evening Session

Annual Dinner

The American and the British College

The Presidential Address

President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College

Principal A. E. Morgan, McGill University

FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 1936

Morning Session

Reports of Sections "A," "B" and "C"

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College

President Frederick B. Robinson, College of the City of
New York

President George B. Cutten, Colgate University

**The College in Social Progress—From the Standpoint of
the Professions**

Education

President Charles F. Wishart, The College of Wooster

Engineering

President Clement C. Williams, Lehigh University

Law

Assistant Dean Paul Brosman, College of Law, Tulane
University, representing the Association of American
Law Schools

Medicine

John Wyckoff, M.D., Dean, College of Medicine, New
York University; President, Association of American
Medical Colleges

Fred C. Zapffe, M.D., Secretary, Association of American
Medical Colleges

Reports of Committees

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Your Committee feels that there are certain items in the report of the Secretary of the Association which deserve special mention and call for an expression of appreciation on our part. The Secretary reported that a well-known Foundation had volunteered to finance certain projects under the direction of the Association of American Colleges. These projects are as follows:

(1) That the preparation of a book be authorized dealing with the imponderables of college music, as a companion study to Thompson's *College Music*, which deals with curriculum problems.

(2) That a service be established by the Association whereby musical talent of a high order be secured for colleges, it being understood that the Association has no talent

to sell but will work only as a buying and distributing agency.

(3) That the Association undertake the administration of an intercollegiate Glee Club organization, the purpose being to hold college Glee Club contests and in other ways to promote this type of high grade performance among college students.

(4) That the Association assume the responsibility of administering a system of grants-in-aid to promising present or prospective teachers of college music.

(5) That the Association be authorized to proceed with an investigation of methods of coordinating the work of the college libraries and the educational programs of the colleges, to the end that the library may become an agency of college teaching of the highest possible significance and value.

I. *Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to express the deep appreciation of the Association to the Foundation which has offered to finance these much needed projects.

II. *Resolved*, That the Association express its appreciation to Mr. J. Fredrick Larson for the splendid work that he has done as architectural advisor of the Association of American Colleges and in the organization of the architectural exhibit.

At the same time, we wish to express our appreciation to Mr. James D. Baum, Mr. Thomas F. Neblett, and Mr. Byron Hanke for the valuable assistance which they have rendered; also to the following institutions for their assistance: The College of Mount St. Vincent, the College of the Sacred Heart, and New York University.

III. *Resolved*, That we express our appreciation to the Secretary of the Association and his co-workers for the efficient services which they are rendering.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) WALTER L. LINGLE, *Chairman*

It was

Voted, To adopt the Report of the Committee on Resolutions.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS, 1936-37

President Wriston announced that the Executive Committee desired unanimously to nominate Robert L. Kelly as Executive Secretary for the year 1936-37.

It was

Voted, That that report, together with the Report of the Nominating Committee be approved, as follows:

For:

President: James R. McCain, President, Agnes Scott College

Vice-President: James L. McConaughy, President, Wesleyan University

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Comptroller, New York University

Executive Secretary: Robert L. Kelly.

Additional Members of the Executive Committee: Henry M. Wriston, President, Lawrence College; Robert M. Lester, Secretary, The Carnegie Corporation; Raymond Walters, President, University of Cincinnati; Edward V. Stanford, President, Villanova College.

Standing Commissions and Committees:

Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure: President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University, *Chairman*; President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College; Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo; President William C. Dennis, Earlham College; President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College; President E. J. Jaqua, Scripps College; President R. A. Kent, University of Louisville; President E. D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University.

Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts: President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman*; Dean Roy J. Deferrari, The Catholic University of America; Director R. H. Fitzgerald, State University of Iowa; President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation; Mr. J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College; Professor Arthur Pope, Harvard University.

* *Commission on the Enlistment and Training of College Teachers*: President Albert Britt, Knox College, *Chairman*; President L. W. Boe, St. Olaf College; President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College; Sister M. Ethelbert, College of Notre Dame of Maryland; Dean Charles H. Oldfather, University of Nebraska.

Committee on Insurance and Annuities: Controller J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan, *Chairman*; Treasurer Horace S. Ford, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; President John S. Nollen, Grinnell College; President John L. Seaton, Albion College.

Committee on Public Service Personnel: Dean A. C. Hanford, Harvard College, *Chairman*; Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University; President Tyler Dennett, Williams College; Professor Marshall E. Dimock, The University of Chicago.

Committee on Publications: The President, *ex officio*; the Executive Secretary, *ex officio*; the Vice-President, *ex officio*.

* Discontinued by the Executive Committee on February 18, 1936.

Committee Sponsoring College Music Study: President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College; Dean L. H. Butler, Syracuse University; Professor G. S. Dickinson, Vassar College; Dr. John Erskine, Juilliard School of Music; Director Howard Hanson, Eastman School of Music, the University of Rochester; Professor Walter E. Hartley, Occidental College; Dean Ernest Hutcheson, Juilliard Graduate School; Dr. W. S. Learned, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Professor Douglas Moore, Columbia University; Professor James B. Munn, Harvard University; President Garfield B. Oxnam, DePauw University; Mr. Myron C. Taylor, United States Steel Corporation; Secretary Burnet C. Tuthill, National Association of Schools of Music; Professor Paul J. Weaver, Cornell University; Professor Karl Young, Yale University; President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College; Robert L. Kelly, *ex officio*.

Representatives on the American Council on Education: President Frank P. Graham, University of North Carolina (three years); Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, The University of Buffalo (two years); President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College (one year).

Representative on National Research Council: Professor E. L. Conklin, Princeton University.

NOTE: Robert L. Kelly is to represent the Association of American Colleges on the committee of the American Council on Education dealing with relationships with the Federal Government.

It is also recommended that the Executive Committee be given power to continue, suspend, or modify the membership of the Committee Sponsoring the College Music Study, as may seem to be advisable in view of the work to be done.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) DONALD J. COWLING, *Chairman*

The Secretary was instructed to cast the unanimous ballot of the Association and the officers and appointees nominated were declared elected.

Dr. Homer P. Rainey, Director of the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, by invitation, spoke briefly on the work of the Commission.

The Annual Meeting of the Association, as a whole, adjourned at 12:00 P. M., after the newly elected President, President James R. McCain, had paid hearty tribute on behalf of the Executive Committee and the Association to the outgoing President, President Wriston.

Afternoon Session

Section "D"—TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION FOR WOMEN

President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College, President, and Dr.

Kathryn McHale, General Director, American Association of University Women, Presiding

Fitting the Curriculum to the Student

President David Allan Robertson, Goucher College

Special Efforts toward Encouraging Independence and Initiative

Dean Mildred Thompson, Vassar College

Utilization of Daily Life as a Distinct Part of Educational Procedure

Dean Mary Ashby Cheek, Mount Holyoke College

Approach to the Arts in Their Deep-Rooted Relation to a Liberally Educated Person

President Aurelia H. Reinhardt, Mills College

Stress on the Relation between College Activities and Citizenship in the Outside World, National and International

Professor Henry W. Lawrence, Connecticut College

Section "E"—PRESENT ALUMNI DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. Felix A. Grisette, Director, Alumni Loyalty Fund, University of North Carolina, President, The American

Alumni Council, Presiding

Developments in Alumni Education

Florence H. Snow, Alumnae Secretary, Smith College

Developments in Alumni Money-Raising

Charles J. Miel, General Manager, University of Pennsylvania Fund

Lay Participation in Alumni Organization

Edna Lee Wood, President, Sweet Briar College Alumnae Association

A distinguished architectural exhibit arranged by Mr. J. Fredrick Larson of Dartmouth College was open to visitors all day Thursday and Friday. A temporary office of the Associa-

tion was established in the hotel and rendered constant service throughout the meeting.

The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America provided facilities for conference with its officers and official representatives both at the hotel and at its headquarters, 522 Fifth Avenue.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT L. KELLY,

Secretary of the Association

RECENTLY ELECTED COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, Pittsburgh, Pa. Robert E. Doherty, Dean, School of Engineering, Yale University.

HOBART AND WILLIAM SMITH COLLEGES, Geneva, N. Y. Dr. William A. Eddy, Professor of English, Dartmouth College.

LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, Lincoln University, Pa. Walter L. Wright, Secretary and Treasurer of the Board of Trustees, Vice-President and Professor of Mathematics of the University.

MCURRY COLLEGE, Abilene, Tex. Thomas W. Brabham, President, Texas Wesleyan College.

SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, Georgetown, Tex. J. W. Bergin. Presiding Elder, Georgetown District, Central Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA. George Finlay Simmons. Member of the University staff.

TEXAS WESLEYAN COLLEGE, Fort Worth, Tex. Law Sone, Dean of the College.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, College Park, Md. H. C. Byrd, Vice-President of the University.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR YEAR ENDING JANUARY, 1937

Executive Secretary, ROBERT L. KELLY

President, JAMES R. MCCAIN, President of Agnes Scott College

Vice-President, JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY, President of Wesleyan University

Treasurer, LEROY E. KIMBALL, Comptroller of New York University

ROBERT M. LESTER, Secretary of the Carnegie Corporation

EDWARD V. STANFORD, President of Villanova College

RAYMOND WALTERS, President of the University of Cincinnati

HENRY M. WRISTON, President of Lawrence College

The Association of American Colleges is not a standardizing agency. Election to membership does not involve any kind of academic status except that stipulated in the *By-Laws* of the Association. By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the university college of liberal arts. Unless otherwise indicated the name of the president or the chancellor is given in the column headed Executive Officer.

INSTITUTION

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

ALABAMA

Alabama College, Montevallo.....	A. F. Harman
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn.....	L. N. Duncan
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham.....	Guy E. Snavely
Howard College, Birmingham.....	T. V. Neal
Huntingdon College, Montgomery.....	W. D. Agnew
Judson College, Marion.....	L. G. Cleverdon
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill.....	John J. Druhan
Talladega College, Talladega.....	B. G. Gallagher
Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, Tuskegee Institute,	
	Frederick D. Patterson

ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson.....	Homer LeRoy Shantz
------------------------------------	--------------------

ARKANSAS

Arkansas State College, Jonesboro.....	V. C. Kays
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville.....	Wiley Lin Hurie
Hendrix College, Conway.....	J. H. Reynolds

CALIFORNIA

Claremont Colleges, Claremont.....	James A. Blaisdell
Pomona College, Claremont.....	Charles K. Edmunds
Scripps College, Claremont.....	E. J. Jaqua
College of the Holy Names, Oakland.....	Sister Mary Austin, <i>Dean</i>
College of the Pacific, Stockton.....	Tully C. Knoles

Dominican College, San Rafael.....	Mother M. Raymond
Immaculate Heart College, Hollywood.....	Sister Mary Redempta
La Verne College, La Verne.....	Ellis M. Studebaker
Loyola University, Los Angeles.....	Hugh M. Duce
Mills College, Mills College.....	Aurelia H. Reinhardt
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles.....	Mother Margaret Mary
Occidental College, Los Angeles.....	Remsen duBois Bird
St. Mary's College, Oakland.....	Brother Albert
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco.....	Mother M. Guerin
Stanford University, Stanford University.....	Ray Lyman Wilbur
University of Redlands, Redlands.....	Clarence H. Thurber
University of San Francisco, San Francisco.....	W. I. Lonergan
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.....	R. B. von KleinSmid
Whittier College, Whittier.....	W. O. Mendenhall

COLORADO

Colorado College, Colorado Springs.....	Thurston J. Davies
University of Denver, Denver.....	David S. Duncan

CONNECTICUT

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven.....	Sister M. Isabel
Connecticut College, New London.....	Katharine Blunt
Trinity College, Hartford.....	Remsen B. Ogilby
Wesleyan University, Middletown.....	J. L. McConaughy

DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark.....	Walter Hulihan
-------------------------------------	----------------

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The American University, Washington.....	Joseph M. M. Gray
The Catholic University of America, Washington,	Patrick M. McCormick, <i>Acting</i>
George Washington University, Washington.....	C. H. Marvin
Georgetown University, Washington.....	Arthur A. O'Leary
Howard University, Washington.....	Mordecai W. Johnson

FLORIDA

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee.....	J. R. E. Lee
Florida-Southern College, Lakeland.....	Ludd M. Spivey
Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee.....	Edward Conradi
John B. Stetson University, Deland.....	W. S. Allen
Rollins College, Winter Park.....	Hamilton Holt
University of Florida, Gainesville.....	John J. Tigert

GEORGIA

Agnes Scott College, Decatur.....	James R. McCain
Berry College, Mount Berry.....	G. Leland Green

Bessie Tift College, Forsyth.....	Aquila Chamlee
Brenau College, Gainesville.....	H. J. Pearce
Clark University, Atlanta.....	M. S. Davage
Emory University, Emory University.....	Harvey W. Cox
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville.....	Guy H. Wells
Georgia State Woman's College, Valdosta.....	Jere M. Pound
Morris Brown College, Atlanta.....	Wm. A. Fountain, Jr.
Mercer University, Macon.....	Spright Dowell
Morehouse College, Atlanta.....	Samuel H. Archer
Paine College, Augusta.....	E. C. Peters
Piedmont College, Demorest.....	Henry C. Newell
Shorter College, Rome.....	Paul M. Cousins
Spelman College, Atlanta.....	Florence M. Read
University of Georgia, Athens.....	Harmon W. Caldwell
Wesleyan College, Macon.....	Dice R. Anderson

IDAHO

College of Idaho, Caldwell.....	W. J. Boone
---------------------------------	-------------

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island.....	Conrad Bergendoff
Aurora College, Aurora.....	Theodore Pierson Stephens
Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria.....	F. R. Hamilton
Carthage College, Carthage.....	Rudolph G. Schulz, Jr.
DePaul University, Chicago.....	Michael J. O'Connell
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst.....	Timothy Lehmann
Eureka College, Eureka.....	Clyde L. Lyon
George Williams College, Chicago.....	Hedley P. Dimock, <i>Acting</i>
Greenville College, Greenville.....	Leslie R. Marston
Illinois College, Jacksonville.....	Harold C. Jaquith
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington.....	Harry Wright McPherson
James Millikin University, Decatur.....	John C. Hessler
Knox College, Galesburg.....	
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.....	Herbert M. Moore
Loyola University, Chicago.....	Samuel K. Wilson
McKendree College, Lebanon.....	Clark R. Yost
MacMurray College, Jacksonville.....	Clarence P. McClelland
Monmouth College, Monmouth.....	T. H. McMichael
North Central College, Naperville.....	E. E. Rall
Northwestern University, Evanston.....	Walter Dill Scott
Rockford College, Rockford.....	Gordon K. Chalmers
Rosary College, River Forest.....	Sister Mary Thomas Aquinas
St. Xavier College for Women, Chicago.....	Mother M. Sophia Mitchell
Shurtleff College, Alton.....	Paul L. Thompson
University of Chicago, Chicago.....	A. J. Brumbaugh, <i>Dean</i>
University of Illinois, Urbana.....	M. T. McClure, <i>Dean</i>
Wheaton College, Wheaton.....	James O. Buswell, Jr.

INDIANA

Butler University, Indianapolis.....	James W. Putnam
DePauw University, Greencastle.....	G. Bromley Oxnam
Earlham College, Richmond.....	William C. Dennis
Evansville College, Evansville.....	
Franklin College, Franklin.....	Wm. G. Spencer
Hanover College, Hanover.....	Albert G. Parker, Jr.
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis.....	I. J. Good
Indiana University, Bloomington.....	Wm. L. Bryan
Manchester College, North Manchester.....	Otho Winger
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.....	Donald B. Prentice
St. Mary's College, Notre Dame.....	Sister M. Madeleva
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary of the Woods,	
	Mother Mary Raphael
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.....	John F. O'Hara

IOWA

Central College, Pella.....	Irwin J. Lubbers
Clarke College, Dubuque.....	Sister Mary Agatha Farrell
Coe College, Cedar Rapids.....	Harry M. Gage
Columbia College, Dubuque.....	Thomas Conry
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.....	Herbert J. Burgstahler
Drake University, Des Moines.....	Daniel W. Morehouse
Grinnell College, Grinnell.....	John S. Nollen
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant.....	Harry D. Henry
Parsons College, Fairfield.....	Clarence W. Greene
St. Ambrose College, Davenport.....	Martin Cone
University of Dubuque, Dubuque.....	Paul H. Buchholz
William Penn College, Oskaloosa.....	Henry Randolph Pyle

KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin City.....	Wallace B. Fleming
College of Emporia, Emporia.....	John B. Kelly
Friends University, Wichita.....	David M. Edwards
McPherson College, McPherson.....	V. F. Schwalm
Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison.....	Mother Lucy Dooley
Ottawa University, Ottawa.....	Andrew B. Martin
Southwestern College, Winfield.....	Frank E. Mossman
Sterling College, Sterling.....	H. A. Kelsey
University of Wichita, Wichita.....	W. M. Jardine
Washburn College, Topeka.....	Philip C. King

KENTUCKY

Asbury College, Wilmore.....	H. C. Morrison, <i>Acting</i>
Berea College, Berea.....	W. J. Hutchins
Centre College, Danville.....	Charles J. Turek
Georgetown College, Georgetown.....	Henry N. Sherwood

Kentucky State Industrial College, Frankfort.....	R. B. Atwood
Nazareth College, Louisville.....	Mother Mary Catherine Malone
Union College, Barbourville.....	John Owen Gross
University of Kentucky, Lexington.....	Frank L. McVey
University of Louisville, Louisville.....	R. A. Kent

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport.....	Pierce Cline
H. Sophie Newcomb College, New Orleans.....	Pierce Butler, <i>Dean</i>
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston.....	Geo. W. Bond
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.....	James M. Smith
Loyola University, New Orleans.....	John W. Hynes
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette.....	Edwin L. Stephens
Xavier University, New Orleans.....	Mother M. Agatha

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston.....	Clifton D. Gray
Bowdoin College, Brunswick.....	Kenneth C. M. Sills
Colby College, Waterville.....	Franklin W. Johnson
University of Maine, Orono.....	Arthur A. Hauck

MARYLAND

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore.....	Sister Mary Frances
Goucher College, Baltimore.....	David A. Robertson
Hood College, Frederick.....	Henry I. Stahr
Loyola College, Baltimore.....	Henri J. Wiesel
Morgan College, Baltimore.....	John O. Spencer
Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg.....	Bernard J. Bradley
St. John's College, Annapolis.....	Amos W. W. Woodcock
St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg.....	Sister Paula Dunn
Washington College, Chestertown.....	Gilbert W. Mead
Western Maryland College, Westminster.....	Fred G. Holloway

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst College, Amherst.....	Stanley King
Boston College, Chestnut Hill.....	Louis J. Gallagher
Boston University, Boston.....	Daniel L. Marsh
Clark University, Worcester.....	Wallace W. Atwood
Emmanuel College, Boston.....	Sister Julie
Harvard University, Cambridge.....	James B. Conant
Holy Cross College, Worcester.....	Francis J. Dolan
Massachusetts State College, Amherst.....	Hugh P. Baker
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley.....	Mary Emma Woolley
Regis College, Weston.....	Sister Genevieve Marie
Simmons College, Boston.....	Bancroft Beatley
Springfield College, Springfield.....	A. Z. Mann, <i>Acting</i>
Tufts College, Tufts College.....	John A. Cousens

Wellesley College, Wellesley.....	Ellen F. Pendleton
Wheaton College, Norton.....	J. Edgar Park
Williams College, Williamstown.....	Tyler Dennett
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester.....	Ralph Earle

MICHIGAN

Adrian College, Adrian.....	Harlan L. Feeman
Albion College, Albion.....	John L. Seaton
Alma College, Alma.....	Harry Means Crooks
Battle Creek College, Battle Creek.....	Emil Leffler
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale.....	Willfred Mauck
Hope College, Holland.....	Wynand Wichers
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo.....	Chas. T. Goodsell, <i>Acting</i>
Marygrove College, Detroit.....	George Hermann Derry
Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing.....	Robert S. Shaw
Nazareth College, Nazareth.....	Sister Mary Celestine, <i>Dean</i>
Olivet College, Olivet.....	Joseph H. Brewer
St. Joseph's College and Academy, Adrian.....	Mother M. Gerald
University of Detroit, Detroit.....	A. H. Poetker
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.....	Edward H. Kraus, <i>Dean</i>
Wayne University, Detroit.....	Frank Cody

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis.....	George Sverdrup
Carleton College, Northfield.....	D. J. Cowling
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph.....	Sister Claire, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul.....	Sister Antonia McHugh
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth.....	Mother M. Agnes Somers
College of St. Teresa, Winona.....	Sister Mary A. Molloy
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.....	James H. Moynihan
Concordia College, Moorhead.....	J. N. Brown
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter.....	O. J. Johnson
Hamline University, St. Paul.....	Charles N. Pace
Macalester College, St. Paul.....	John C. Acheson
St. Olaf College, Northfield.....	L. W. Boe

MISSISSIPPI

Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain.....	Lawrence T. Lowrey
Millsaps College, Jackson.....	David M. Key
Mississippi College, Clinton.....	D. M. Nelson
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus.....	B. L. Parkinson
University of Mississippi, University.....	A. B. Butts

MISSOURI

Central College, Fayette.....	Robert H. Ruff
Culver-Stockton College, Canton.....	John Hepler Wood

Drury College, Springfield.....	T. W. Nadal
Fontbonne College, St. Louis.....	Mother Joseph Aloysius
Lindenwood College, St. Charles.....	John L. Roemer
Maryville College, St. Louis.....	Mother Mary Gilmore
Missouri Valley College, Marshall.....	George H. Mack
Park College, Parkville.....	F. W. Hawley
St. Louis University, St. Louis.....	Robert S. Johnston
University of Missouri, Columbia.....	F. M. Tisdal, <i>Dean</i>
Washington University, St. Louis.....	George R. Throop
Westminster College, Fulton.....	Franc L. McCluer
William Jewell College, Liberty.....	John F. Herget

MONTANA

Carroll College, Helena.....	Emmet J. Riley
------------------------------	----------------

NEBRASKA

Creighton University, Omaha.....	Patrick J. Mahan
Doane College, Crete.....	Edwin B. Dean
Hastings College, Hastings.....	John W. Creighton
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.....	E. Guy Cutshall
York College, York.....	J. R. Overmiller

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover.....	Ernest M. Hopkins
St. Anselm's College, Manchester.....	Bertrand C. Dolan
University of New Hampshire, Durham.....	E. M. Lewis

NEW JERSEY

Brothers College, Drew University, Madison.....	Arlo A. Brown
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station.....	Sister Marie José Byrne, <i>Dean</i>
Georgian Court College, Lakewood.....	Mother M. Cecelia Scully
Princeton University, Princeton.....	Harold W. Dodds
Rutgers University, New Brunswick.....	Robert C. Clothier
The College of Arts and Sciences.....	Walter T. Marvin, <i>Dean</i>
The New Jersey College for Women.....	Margaret T. Corwin, <i>Dean</i>
St. Peter's College, Jersey City.....	Joseph S. Dinneen
Seton Hall College, South Orange.....	Frank J. Monaghan
Upsala College, East Orange.....	Carl G. Erickson

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.....	J. F. Zimmerman
--	-----------------

NEW YORK

Adelphi College, Garden City.....	Frank D. Blodgett
Alfred University, Alfred.....	J. Nelson Norwood
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn.....	William A. Boylan
Canisius College, Buffalo.....	James P. Sweeney

Colgate University, Hamilton	George B. Cutten
College of the City of New York, New York	F. B. Robinson
College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York	Sister Josephine Rosaire, <i>Dean</i>
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle	Cornelius F. Crowley
College of St. Rose, Albany	Sister M. Rosina, <i>Dean</i>
Columbia University, New York	Nicholas Murray Butler
Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson,	Donald G. Tewksbury, <i>Acting Dean</i>
Barnard College, New York	Virginia C. Gildersleeve, <i>Dean</i>
Columbia College, New York	Herbert E. Hawkes, <i>Dean</i>
Cornell University, Ithaca	Robert M. Ogden, <i>Dean</i>
D'Youville College, Buffalo	Mother Saint Edward
Elmira College, Elmira	Wm. S. A. Pott
Fordham University, New York	Aloysius J. Hogan
Good Counsel College, White Plains	Mother M. Aloysia
Hamilton College, Clinton	Frederick C. Ferry
Hobart College, Geneva	Murray Bartlett
Houghton College, Houghton	James S. Luckey
Keuka College, Keuka Park	J. Hillis Miller
Manhattan College, New York	Brother Patrick
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, New York,	Mother Grace C. Dammann
Marymount College, Tarrytown-on-Hudson	Mother M. Gerard
Nazareth College, Rochester	Mother M. Sylvester
New York University, New York	Marshall S. Brown, <i>Dean</i>
Niagara University, Niagara Falls	Joseph M. Noonan
Russell Sage College, Troy	J. L. Meader
Saint Bonaventure's College, Saint Bonaventure	Thomas Plassman
St. John's University, Brooklyn	Edward J. Walsh
St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn	William T. Dillon, <i>Dean</i>
St. Lawrence University, Canton	Lawrence H. Seelye
Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville	Constance Warren
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs	Henry T. Moore
Syracuse University, Syracuse	Charles W. Flint
Union College, Schenectady	Dixon Ryan Fox
United States Military Academy, West Point	W. D. Connor
University of Buffalo, Buffalo	Samuel P. Capen
University of Rochester, Rochester	Alan C. Valentine
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie	Henry N. MacCracken
Wagner College, Staten Island	Clarence C. Stoughton
Wells College, Aurora	Kerr D. Macmillan
Yeshiva College, New York	Bernard Revel

NORTH CAROLINA

Bennett College for Women, Greensboro	David D. Jones
Catawba College, Salisbury	Howard R. Omwake
Davidson College, Davidson	Walter L. Lingle
Duke University, Durham	W. P. Few

Elon College, Elon College.....	L. E. Smith
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs.....	Henry G. Bedinger
Guilford College, Guilford College.....	Clyde A. Milner
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte.....	H. L. McCrorey
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory.....	P. E. Monroe
Meredith College, Raleigh.....	Charles E. Brewer
North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham.....	James E. Shepard
Salem College, Winston-Salem.....	H. E. Rondthaler
Shaw University, Raleigh.....	Wm. Stuart Nelson
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.....	Frank P. Graham

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown.....	B. H. Kroeze
-----------------------------------	--------------

OHIO

Antioch College, Yellow Springs.....	Arthur E. Morgan
Ashland College, Ashland.....	Chas. L. Anspach
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea.....	Louis C. Wright
Bluffton College, Bluffton.....	A. S. Rosenberger
Capital University, Columbus.....	Otto Mees
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph.....	Sister Maria Corona, Dean
College of Wooster, Wooster.....	C. F. Wishart
Defiance College, Defiance.....	Frederick W. Raymond
Denison University, Granville.....	A. A. Shaw
Findlay College, Findlay.....	Homer R. Dunathan
Heidelberg College, Tiffin.....	Charles E. Miller
Hiram College, Hiram.....	Kenneth I. Brown
John Carroll University, Cleveland.....	Benedict J. Rodman
Lake Erie College, Painesville.....	Vivian B. Small
Marietta College, Marietta.....	Edward S. Parsons
Mary Manse College, Toledo.....	Sister M. Catherine Raynor
Mount Union College, Alliance.....	W. H. McMaster
Muskingum College, New Concord.....	Robert N. Montgomery
Notre Dame College, South Euclid.....	Mother Mary Evarista
Oberlin College, Oberlin.....	Ernest H. Wilkins
Ohio Northern University, Ada.....	Robert Williams
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.....	Edmund D. Soper
Otterbein College, Westerville.....	W. G. Clippinger
St. John's University, Toledo.....	Gerald A. Fitzgibbons
St. Mary's of the Springs College, East Columbus.....	Sister M. Bernardine
University of Akron, Akron.....	H. E. Simmons
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.....	Raymond Walters
University of Toledo, Toledo.....	Philip C. Nash
Ursuline College, Cleveland.....	Mother M. Veronica
Western College, Oxford.....	Ralph K. Hickok
Western Reserve University, Cleveland.....	W. G. Leutner
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce.....	R. R. Wright, Jr.

Wilmington College, Wilmington.....	Walter L. Collins
Wittenberg College, Springfield.....	Rees E. Tulloss
Xavier University, Cincinnati.....	Dennis F. Burns

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater.....	H. G. Bennett
Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee.....	John W. Raley
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City.....	A. G. Williamson
Phillips University, Enid.....	I. N. McCash
University of Tulsa, Tulsa.....	C. I. Pontius

OREGON

Albany College, Albany.....	Thomas W. Bibb
Linfield College, McMinnville.....	Elam J. Anderson
Pacific University, Forest Grove.....	John F. Dobbs
Reed College, Portland.....	Dexter M. Keezer
Willamette University, Salem.....	Bruce R. Baxter

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Reading.....	J. Warren Klein
Allegheny College, Meadville.....	William P. Tolley
Bucknell University, Lewisburg.....	A. C. Marts, <i>Acting</i>
College Misericordia, Dallas.....	Sister Mary Loretta
Dickinson College, Carlisle.....	Fred P. Corson
Drexel Institute, Philadelphia.....	Parke R. Kolbe
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh.....	Stephen J. Bryan, <i>Acting</i>
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown.....	R. W. Schlosser
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.....	John A. Schaeffer
Geneva College, Beaver Falls.....	McLeod M. Pearce
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.....	Henry W. A. Hanson
Grove City College, Grove City.....	Weir C. Ketler
Haverford College, Haverford.....	W. W. Comfort
Immaculata College, Immaculata.....	Vincent L. Burns
Juniata College, Huntingdon.....	Charles C. Ellis
Lafayette College, Easton.....	William Mather Lewis
Lebanon Valley College, Annville.....	Clyde A. Lynch
Lehigh University, Bethlehem.....	Clement C. Williams
Lincoln University, Lincoln University.....	Walter L. Wright
Marywood College, Scranton.....	Mother M. Josepha
Mercyhurst College, Erie.....	Sister B. Borgia Egan, <i>Dean</i>
Moravian College, Bethlehem.....	William N. Schwarze
Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem.....	Edwin J. Heath
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh.....	Mother M. Irenaeus
Mount St. Joseph College, Chestnut Hill.....	Sister Maria Kostka, <i>Dean</i>
Muhlenberg College, Allentown.....	John A. W. Haas
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh.....	Herbert L. Spencer
Pennsylvania State College, State College.....	R. D. Hetzel

Rosemont College, Rosemont.....	Mother Mary Ignatius
St. Francis College, Loretto.....	John P. J. Sullivan
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia.....	Thomas J. Higgins
St. Thomas College, Scranton.....	Brother D. Edward
St. Vincent College, Latrobe.....	Alfred Koch
Seton Hill College, Greensburg.....	James A. W. Reeves
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove.....	G. Morris Smith
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore.....	Frank Aydelotte
Temple University, Philadelphia.....	Charles E. Beury
Thiel College, Greenville.....	Earl S. Rudisill
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.....	Thomas S. Gates
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.....	John G. Bowman
Ursinus College, Collegeville.....	George L. Omwake
Villa Maria College, Erie.....	Joseph J. Wehrle
Villanova College, Villanova.....	Edward V. Stanford
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington.....	Ralph C. Hutchison
Waynesboro College, Waynesburg.....	Paul R. Stewart
Westminster College, New Wilmington.....	Robert F. Galbreath
Wilson College, Chambersburg.....	Ethelbert D. Warfield

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence.....	Clarence A. Barbour
Pembroke College in Brown University, Providence, Margaret S. Morris, <i>Dean</i>	
Providence College, Providence.....	Lorenzo C. McCarthy

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coker College, Hartsville.....	Carlyle Campbell
College of Charleston, Charleston.....	Harrison Randolph
Columbia College, Columbia.....	J. Caldwell Guilds
Converse College, Spartanburg.....	Edward M. Gwathmey
Erskine College, Due West.....	Robert C. Grier
Furman University, Greenville.....	Ben E. Geer
Lander College, Greenwood.....	John W. Speake
Limestone College, Gaffney.....	R. C. Granberry
Newberry College, Newberry.....	James C. Kinard
Winthrop College, Rock Hill.....	Shelton J. Phelps
Wofford College, Spartanburg.....	Henry N. Snyder

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls.....	Clemens M. Granskou
Huron College, Huron.....	Frank L. Eversull
Yankton College, Yankton.....	George W. Nash

TENNESSEE

Cumberland University, Lebanon.....	Ernest L. Stockton
Fisk University, Nashville.....	Thomas E. Jones
King College, Bristol.....	Thos. P. Johnston

Knoxville College, Knoxville.....	J. Kelly Giffen
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate.....	S. W. McClelland
Maryville College, Maryville.....	Ralph W. Lloyd
Milligan College, Milligan.....	H. J. Derthick
Southwestern, Memphis.....	Charles E. Diehl
Tennessee College for Women, Murfreesboro.....	Edward L. Atwood
Tusculum College, Greeneville.....	Charles A. Anderson
Union University, Jackson.....	John J. Hurt
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga.....	Alexander Guerry
University of the South, Sewanee.....	B. F. Finney
Vanderbilt University, Nashville.....	J. H. Kirkland

TEXAS

Abilene Christian College, Abilene.....	James F. Cox
Baylor University, Waco.....	Pat M. Neff
Bishop College, Marshall.....	Joseph J. Rhoads
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene.....	Jefferson D. Sandefer
Howard Payne College, Brownwood.....	Thomas H. Taylor
Ircarnate Word College, San Antonio.....	Sister M. Columkille
Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Belton.....	John C. Hardy
McMurtry College, Abilene.....	Tom W. Brabham
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio.....	H. A. Contantineau
Rice Institute, Houston.....	E. O. Lovett
St. Edward's University, Austin.....	Joseph Maguire
St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio.....	Alfred H. Rabe
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.....	Charles C. Selecman
Southwestern University, Georgetown.....	J. W. Bergin
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.....	E M. Waits
Texas College, Tyler.....	D. R. Glass
Texas State College for Women, Denton.....	L. H. Hubbard
Texas Technological College, Lubbock.....	Bradford Knapp
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth.....	Law Sone
Trinity University, Waxahachie.....	Raymond H. Leach
Wiley College, Marshall.....	M. W. Dogan

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo.....	F. S. Harris
University of Utah, Salt Lake City.....	George Thomas

VERMONT

Middlebury College, Middlebury.....	Paul D. Moody
Norwich University, Northfield.....	Porter H. Adams
University of Vermont, Burlington.....	Guy W. Bailey

VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater.....	Paul H. Bowman
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg.....	John S. Bryan

Emory and Henry College, Emory.....	J. N. Hillman
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney.....	J. D. Eggleston
Hampton Institute, Hampton.....	Arthur Howe
Hollins College, Hollins.....	Bessie C. Randolph
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg.....	J. T. T. Hundley
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton.....	L. Wilson Jarman
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland.....	R. E. Blackwell
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg.....	Theodore H. Jack
Roanoke College, Salem.....	Charles J. Smith
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar.....	Meta Glass
University of Richmond, Richmond.....	F. W. Boatwright
University of Virginia, Charlottesville.....	John L. Newcomb
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington.....	John A. Lejeune
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.....	Julian A. Burruss
Virginia State College, Ettrick.....	John M. Gandy
Virginia Union University, Richmond.....	William J. Clark
Washington and Lee University, Lexington.....	Francis P. Gaines

WASHINGTON

College of Puget Sound, Tacoma.....	Edward H. Todd
Gonzaga University, Spokane.....	John J. Keep
Whitman College, Walla Walla.....	Rudolf A. Clemen

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany.....	W. H. Cramblet
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins.....	Chas. E. Albert, <i>Acting</i>
Marshall College, Huntington.....	James E. Allen
Salem College, Salem.....	S. O. Bond
West Virginia State College, Institute.....	John W. Davis
West Virginia University, Morgantown.....	C. S. Boucher
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon.....	Roy McCusky

WISCONSIN

Beloit College, Beloit.....	Irving Maurer
Carroll College, Waukesha.....	Wm. Arthur Ganfield
Lawrence College, Appleton.....	Henry M. Wriston
Milton College, Milton.....	Jay W. Crofoot
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee.....	Lucia R. Briggs
Mount Mary College, Milwaukee.....	Edward A. Fitzpatrick
Northland College, Ashland.....	J. D. Brownell
Ripon College, Ripon.....	Silas Evans

CANADA

Victoria University, Toronto, Ontario.....	E. W. Wallace
--	---------------

HONORARY MEMBERS

American Association for the Advancement of Science
 American Association of University Professors

American Association of University Women
American Council of Learned Societies
American Council on Education
Carnegie Corporation
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Council of Church Boards of Education and its constituent Boards
General Education Board
Institute of International Education
John F. Slater Fund
National Research Council
Rockefeller Foundation
Social Science Research Council
United States Office of Education

THE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

The BULLETIN of the Association of American Colleges keeps its readers advised as to the progress of hundreds of colleges. It does not deal in what the daily papers call "news" but goes deeper into policies and plans in practically all phases of college administration and teaching.

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, November and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

Annual Subscription Rates: Regular, \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each.

Further description, list of other publications and convenient order blank will be found on the back cover of this issue.

CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

THE PURPOSE of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

Name: The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges."

Membership: All colleges which conform to the definition of a minimum college given in the By-Laws may become members of this Association. The general secretaries of church boards of education and officials of educational foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

Representation: Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the faculty or board of trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of church boards cooperating with such an institution and the representatives of foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

Officers: The Association shall elect a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be charged with the duties usually connected with their respective offices. The Secretary shall be the permanent executive officer of the Association, and shall serve without term until his successor is elected. The other officers shall serve for one year, or until their successors are duly elected. The Association shall also elect four others who, with the four officers named above, shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association. The President of the Association shall be *ex-officio* chairman of the Executive Committee. The election of officers shall be by ballot.

Meetings: At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the

Executive Committee, provided that four weeks' notice be given each institution connected with the Association. Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

By-Laws: The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

Vacancies: The Executive Committee is authorized to fill vacancies *ad interim* in the offices of the Association.

Amendments: Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two (2) seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members then present.

BY-LAWS*

1. Applications for membership shall be made to the Executive Committee, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.

2. The annual dues shall be fifty dollars per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.

3. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Executive Committee.

4. All expenditure of the funds of the Association shall be authorized by the Association, or, subject to later approval by the Association, by the Executive Committee.

5. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.

6. The Secretary is authorized to mail three copies of all official bulletins to all institutions which are members of the Association. Additional subscriptions, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be made at a special rate.

7. These By-Laws may be amended at any business session of the Association by two-thirds vote, notice of the proposed amendment having been presented at a previous session.

* Adopted as revised January 17, 1936.

POLICY

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than of exclusiveness.*

FORMER PRESIDENTS

- 1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted*
- 1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College
- 1916-17 President Henry Churchill King,* Oberlin College
- 1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College
- President Hill M. Bell,* Drake University, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College
- 1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University
- 1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
- 1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University
- 1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College
- President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College
- 1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University
- 1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College
- 1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger,* University of Michigan
- 1927-28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College
- 1928-29 President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board
- 1929-30 President Guy E. Snavelly, Birmingham-Southern College
- 1930-31 Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University
- 1931-32 President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College
- 1932-33 President Irving Maurer, Beloit College
- 1933-34 President Edmund D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University
- 1934-35 President William Mather Lewis, Lafayette College
- 1935-36 President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College

* Deceased.

A SPRING CALENDAR OF EDUCATIONAL MEETINGS

MARCH

- American Association of Dental Schools, Louisville, Ky., March 16-18.
Music Educators National Conference, New York, March 29.
National Association of Collegiate Deans and Registrars in Negro Schools, Knoxville, Tenn., March 25-27.

APRIL

- American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, April 24-25.
American Alumni Council, Cincinnati, April 19-22.
American Association of Collegiate Registrars, Detroit, April 14-16.
American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, April 24-25.
American Physical Education Association, St. Louis, April 15-18.
Classical Association of New England, Brunswick, Me., April 3-4.
Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Cleveland, April 9-11.
College Art Association of America, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art and Museum of Modern Art, April 8-10.
Eastern Arts Association, New York, April 15-18.
Educational Buyers Association, Ithaca, N. Y., April 1-3.
Midwestern Psychological Association, Evanston, Ill., April 24-25.
National Association of College Women, Cincinnati, April 10-12.
National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, Philadelphia, April 30-May 2.
National Association of Directors of Physical Education for College Women, St. Louis, April 12-14.
New England College Entrance Certificate Board, Boston, April 28.
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, April 22-25.
Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, Spokane, April 7-8.
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology, Atlanta, April 10-11.
Western Arts Association, Nashville, April 1-4.

MAY

- American Federation of Arts, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, May 13-15.
American Council on Education, Washington, May 1-2.
American Library Association, Richmond, Va., May 11-16.
Association of Modern Language Teachers of the Central West and South, Detroit, May 1-2.
Association of University and College Business Officers, Fayetteville, Ark., May 7-8.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

HERBERT E. HAWKES: If by integrity we mean the possession of that uprightness and rectitude which enables us and our students to meet the world in which we are submerged squarely and intelligently, there is only one way to maintain it. Surrounded by the intellectual, and social and moral confusion it is absolutely necessary for us to see to it that during the entire college experience our students acquire the habit of viewing dispassionately and objectively all sides of the question that confront them.

CHARLES F. WISHART: The other alternative is, I think, a uniform M.A. requirement of all teachers in the secondary schools, and the frank adoption of a five-year course for teacher-training in all institutions alike. Hard-pressed through these bitter financial storms, many good colleges are fearful of attempting this experiment unless it is enforced upon all alike. Perhaps the prestige of superior training and outstanding personal products would be such as to make this economic fear entirely groundless.

FRANCIS H. TAYLOR: What do your students know of history and of that great by-product of history, biography? They want to cram themselves full of facts which may be obsolete five years after graduation in the belief that this will teach them to manipulate people. Yet they never stop to study the lives of men and women who have changed the course of history. It may be prejudice on my part, but I am convinced that a careful reading of Plutarch, of Machiavelli and of Benevenuto Cellini, is a better preparation for a career on the Stock Exchange than either an introductory course in credit and banking in a business school, or a sophomore course in psychology.

CLEMENT C. WILLIAMS: Today, because of increased complexity, fewer and fewer technical graduates find their training a specific preparation for the vocation which they subsequently follow. The demand involves, therefore, more than a training to perform certain operations; it is for an education that affords versatility in the face of changing economic and social conditions. The acme of technical education hereafter will be an equipment for a possible vocation plus an accessory preparation to shift to any of the variants thereof or to its economic correlatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

are reminded of employment facilities
containing records of approximately
2000 members offering assistance in
selection of qualified teachers :: ::

APPOINTMENT SERVICE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

*744 Jackson Place, N. W.
Washington, D. C.*

Non-members of the A. A. U. P.
may subscribe to the

BULLETIN

as indicated by rates below

(1935 volume contains complete membership list)

Subscription price, payable in advance,
\$3.00 per year (\$3.50 for foreign
subscriptions, including Canada)

Address:

American Association of University Professors
744 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C.

